



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2013

No. 120

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

September 12, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

Though having returned so recently, the House prepares to leave for a long weekend. Many of its Members prepare to observe Yom Kippur—the Day of Atonement.

At a time of great international tensions, many others will take pause to acknowledge past failures and renew efforts at peaceful and productive resolutions to ongoing difficulties.

On this day, give the Members of this assembly listening hearts and a willingness to give to each other time and attention. May they be ready to respond to Your Spirit living in each of their colleagues.

And may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TONKO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

LACK OF LEADERSHIP

(Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, we're living in a dangerous world abroad, with challenging economic times at home, but America has been here before.

On Tuesday, Americans witnessed the embarrassing and dangerous results of this administration's lack of a coherent foreign policy: Vladimir Putin filled the global leadership void. What happens next with Syria and that region is anyone's guess, but it's clear that America is not in the driver's seat.

The President failed to convince me—and most of the American people—that military action in Syria is in our best interests. This debate was not conducted from a position of foreign policy strength because Syria was allowed to fester. Flawed attempts at coalition building failed.

Iran is ever closer to a nuclear bomb. Iran funds terrorist organizations. Iran's influence in the region is significant. And a Middle Eastern arms race would likely follow, the results of which could be catastrophic.

The world is looking to America for leadership. The American people are looking to this President for leadership. Mr. President, it's time for you to step up to the plate.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, recent superstorms like Hurricane Sandy, Hurricane Irene, and Tropical Storm Lee have tested the resiliency of our infrastructure. During these severe weather events, bridges failed, blackouts occurred, and communities were devastated by flooding at the same time that our water supply systems failed. It took weeks to restore these vital services. Our electricity, potable

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5515

water, and transportation networks must be reliable even in the face of severe storms.

The American people need and deserve a Congress that will work together to address the present and growing threat of climate change and do what is necessary to ensure the resiliency of our roads, bridges, electrical grid, dams, and water systems. Accomplishing this would create jobs and support our communities and our economy.

This week, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reported that Sandy-like flooding is now twice as likely due to the sea level rise associated with climate change. One need look no further to understand that the time is now to act on climate.

UNAFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, all over this country many thousands are not being hired because of the so-called Affordable Care Act, which is really unaffordable. Many thousands more are seeing their hours cut so they do not go over the 30-hour-week threshold. Someone said the new normal is now two 20-hour-a-week jobs.

Now the State of Tennessee has had to notify 16,000 Tennesseans they can no longer have coverage under CoverTN, a low-cost health care plan for small businesses and the self-employed. The plan is being abolished because it does not meet all the bureaucratic requirements of ObamaCare.

Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER said:

The new health care law has destroyed an innovative State health insurance plan that is helping 16,000 Tennesseans afford health care coverage.

When the President was selling ObamaCare to Americans, he said again and again that people who had insurance they liked could keep it. Despite the President's promises, Tennesseans enrolled with CoverTN are among the thousands of Americans who are being forced to buy new, more expensive plans with much higher premiums because of the "Unaffordable Care Act."

JOBS, JOBS, JOBS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, it's now been 2 years since President Obama stood before a Joint Session of Congress to present a comprehensive and cost-effective plan to address our national jobs crisis.

With all eyes now on Syria, the CR, and the debt limit, we cannot forget that the emergency for tens of millions of Americans is still painful and pervasive joblessness. It's now been 2 years,

and the President's bill, the American Jobs Act, has still not even received a vote in this House.

Madam Speaker, it's time to commit to a serious jobs agenda that stops sequester layoffs and provides real options for the long-term unemployed people in our Nation. It's time to bring the American Jobs Act of 2013 to the floor. Madam Speaker, the mantra of this Congress should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

"NEW NORMAL" II

(Mr. MEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, my colleagues and I have returned to Washington after spending time back in our districts with our constituents, and it's clear we've got our work cut out for us.

Already we've been hearing personal stories—and I know I did—of folks in our districts who are having trouble making ends meet in this new normal under the Obama economy.

And last week, we found things were only getting worse with unemployment. This rate has been too high for too long. Millions of our fellow Americans are unemployed, with an average of 8.5 months out of work.

The simple truth is they deserve better.

House Republicans have a solid plan to put Americans back to work and secure our future. To do that, we believe the solution lies in expanding our freedom and opportunity, not restricting it.

KSBW CELEBRATES 60-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in the United States Congress to celebrate and honor our local television station—it started 60 years ago—KSBW, an NBC affiliate for the central coast of California. SBW stands for "Salad Bowl Capital of the World," which is what the Salinas area is known for.

In September 1953, the station opened, and it proudly represented the whole feeling of the central coast to have its first television station. I was 12 years old, and I remember sitting there with my father as he was being interviewed on that television station. It went through decades of being the area's first station to provide local news. It was the first station to broadcast in color. It was the first to broadcast news reports from the field. It was the first to broadcast in high definition.

For the past 15 years, the station has been owned by the 126-year-old Hearst Corporation and led locally by Joseph

W. Heston as president and general manager. Hearst continues to operate a full-time Washington, D.C., news bureau, making KSBW the only local station on the central coast to provide direct reports from Washington to local constituents.

Congratulations, KSBW, for 60 years of firsts. I wish them another 60 years of great success on the central coast.

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION WEEK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Suicide Prevention Week.

Suicide is a serious public health problem that takes an alarming toll on so many individuals, including our military personnel and veterans. A growing number of returning service-members and veterans suffer from posttraumatic stress, acute brain injuries, severe anxiety, depression, and a variety of other mental illnesses from battle. The U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs released a study in February 2013 which estimates that approximately 24 veterans commit suicide every day.

Our highest priority must be the mental health and well-being of our friends, our colleagues, and loved ones, and also the brave men and women who serve our Nation. Should one fear that someone they know is in crisis or depressed, giving that person an opportunity to open up and share their troubles with you can go a long way.

National Suicide Prevention Week is a time for all of us to learn more about suicide, its warning signs, and what can be done to help those in need.

PANCREATIC CANCER

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to a disease that plagues our Nation and my home State of Florida—that is pancreatic cancer.

Unfortunately, pancreatic cancer today remains the fourth leading cause of cancer death, with a 5-year survival rate of just 6 percent. In 2013, the Pancreatic Cancer Network anticipates that there will be 3,380 new cases of pancreatic cancer in Florida alone.

Last year, Congress passed the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which calls on the National Cancer Institute to help develop a scientific framework for combating pancreatic cancer. This was an important step forward, but there is clearly more that we can do and should be done.

We must continue to fund investments in the National Cancer Institute's research so that they can better

understand how to prevent and treat this disease. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this critical funding and to renew and strengthen our commitment to combating pancreatic cancer.

□ 0915

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, in less than 3 weeks, the Special Immigrant Visa program expires. This is something we created to help bring people who served Americans in Iraq and Afghanistan as interpreters, guides, drivers, people who helped our soldiers, who put their lives at risk, to be able to escape to safety. Unfortunately there are people with long memories who are there seeking revenge against those who have helped us.

But sadly, this project has been hampered by what can only be charitably described as "bureaucratic ineptitude." The State Department can't even tell us how many thousands of people are in the backlog. Chairman ROGERS just this week told me that an interpreter for one of his heroes is trying to seek refuge in the United States.

The program will expire September 30. If we can't help the State Department fix it, we can at least extend it in the continuing resolution so that we've got a chance for these people who gave so much for Americans to be able to get the refuge that they deserve.

NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 339, I call up the bill (H.R. 2775) to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 339, the amendment printed in House Report 113-206 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2775

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No Subsidies Without Verification Act".

SEC. 2. CONDITIONING PROVISION OF ACA PREMIUM AND COST-SHARING SUBSIDIES UPON CERTIFICATION THAT A PROGRAM TO VERIFY HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND OTHER QUALIFICATIONS FOR THOSE SUBSIDIES IS OPERATIONAL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no premium tax credits shall be allowed under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and no reductions in cost-sharing shall be allowed under section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18071) before the date that the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services certifies to the Congress that there is in place a program that successfully and consistently verifies, consistent with section 1411 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18081), the household income and coverage requirements of individuals applying for such credits and cost-sharing reductions prior to making the benefits available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 10 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 2275.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to speak about the economic disaster facing all Americans on October 1.

Nearly 3 years ago, I decided to run for office for one primary reason: to defeat and repeal Obamacare. Three years later, this terrible law is set to be implemented and the dire warnings and predictions are already coming true.

This past summer alone, we saw three major delays in the law's implementation—from the employee mandate to consumer price caps to the issue we are debating here today.

Congresswoman BLACK's bill, H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, is a first step at attacking the latter.

The premise of this bill is quite simple. Serving as the stewards of taxpayer dollars is one of our most important jobs as Members of Congress. After all, dollars wasted by Congress or improperly spent by the executive branch has a direct impact on the budgets of families across this country who are struggling to pay their bills.

This is why I was appalled by this summer's announcement by the De-

partment of Health and Human Services. In the 600-page rule issued during the July 4 holiday, HHS stated that they would no longer verify income for ObamaCare subsidies. Instead, the Obama administration would now rely on self-attestation and sample audits when launching the ObamaCare exchange subsidy program—an initiative that is estimated to cost over \$1 trillion over the next decade.

After receiving criticism, HHS announced that they would reverse course and extend audits to all applicants. Yet, to this date, the administration has issued no formal change in the rule to codify this policy. In other words, they are saying one thing and doing another.

As it stands today, the rule issued by HHS reads:

The exchange may accept the applicant's attestation without further verification.

And yet, while verification has been removed, the fines remain in place. Any applicant who enters information improperly could possibly face a \$25,000 fine. If the mistake is knowing and willful, the fine could grow as high as \$250,000.

As Ronald Reagan famously said, "trust, but verify." If history is any guide, these claims of accountability will be disregarded unless oversight is enforced.

This only reinforces the need for the No Subsidies Without Verification Act. The bill would simply require certification systems to be in place so that the administrators can successfully and consistently verify eligibility before any premiums and cost-sharing credits are paid out.

Similar language was adopted by the Senate, but the bill before us would implement a bipartisan consensus and protect taxpayer dollars. It would do so by requiring the inspector general of HHS to certify that income verification is in place before precious taxpayer dollars are wasted and abused.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2775, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill before us today is nothing more than another page out of the Republican playbook to delay, derail, and otherwise repeal the Affordable Care Act. Rather than a productive, bipartisan effort to ensure successful implementation, Republicans will instead waste more precious floor time to take their 41st vote that undermines and repeals the Affordable Care Act.

H.R. 2775 is based on a flawed premise that HHS does not have the verifications in place to ensure that families who are getting financial help are eligible for that help.

But my Republican friends, that's simply not true, and your bill will do nothing but prevent millions of hard-working American families from gaining Affordable Care Act coverage.

First and foremost, this bill is totally unnecessary. HHS already has

stated in regulations that they will check and verify income on 100 percent of the applications. If someone receives payments that they determine aren't substantiated, those payments will have to be paid back—100 percent verified and reconciled.

Here is how it works. To get subsidies to make their health insurance affordable, hardworking Americans and families will submit their projected annual household income through the marketplaces. The data will then be checked against IRS data, Social Security data, and current wage information. If there is an inconsistency, the marketplaces will require additional documentation from applicants.

In addition, marketplaces will check employer coverage information from the applicant and their employer against data from a number of employer data sources approved by HHS to verify eligibility for the subsidies. If applicant information and other data do not match, the marketplaces will ask for further supporting documentation.

And lastly, all payments of premium tax credits are reconciled by IRS the following year. The income data submitted to the marketplaces are reconciled against the actual wages and health-covered information on the individual's income tax return. If there is an inconsistency, the applicant pays back the excess.

Let me repeat that part, that last part, Madam Speaker, because it is the most critical. Even after HHS has verified wage information on each individual situation that arises before tax credits are sent out, the income information will still be doublechecked again against actual wages on the individual's income tax return the following year. So if there is an inconsistency, the applicant pays back the excess. There is, again, 100 percent income verification and reconciliation on the back end.

Madam Speaker, both CBO and JCT, the Joint Committee on Taxation, confirmed this, stating that the program HHS has in place satisfies the certification requirements under section 1411 of the law—proving, again, that this bill is simply irrelevant.

But, of course, in light of this report, our Republicans at the twelfth hour have hastily amended the bill. The new language will basically ask the IG of HHS to formally certify these verification systems, which does nothing but delay the start of the law and deny millions of hardworking Americans from getting the tax credits they're clearly eligible for.

I maintained in Rules last night, and I'll maintain again, this is not the responsibility of the inspector general. The inspector general doesn't do this. They probably can't do this.

The IG's office has confirmed these implications by stating that this new language places unworkable requirements on their office and that it has no resources to perform this and that it is

outside of its traditional role. The Republicans know very well all of this, and that's the exact reason they made this change. It's simply a delay tactic.

□ 0930

Again, the IG won't be able to do this. This is not its traditional role. So the only thing that happens here, Madam Speaker, is that this is a legislation which, of course, will never pass; but if it did pass and got signed by the President, which would never happen, it would simply delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and that's what the Republicans want. Repeal, delay, defund—this is what they're all about. It's the 41st vote, again, to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Madam Speaker, we are 20 days away from October 1, when millions of uninsured Americans will finally get access to quality, affordable health care. No longer will hardworking families worry about getting sick or injured or losing coverage because of the loss of a job, because the Affordable Care Act gives health security and peace of mind. For those hardworking families who need additional tools to help them afford their health coverage, the ACA will help make coverage a reality.

So despite the delay tactics in this bill and the millions of hours and dollars spent to derail the ACA, the law is moving forward. Organizations across this country, including labor, small businesses, employers, health care providers, advocates, religious leaders, and others, will continue to focus on helping uninsured Americans gain access to health care.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. It is, again, an unnecessary delay; but I at least am optimistic in knowing that the ACA will move forward and that the Republicans will not have success.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee.

Mr. PITTS. I rise in support of H.R. 2775, and I commend the gentlelady, Congresswoman BLACK, and also Congresswoman ELLMERS for their leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, earlier this year, we found out that the IRS flagged for further review 90 percent of Americans who claimed the adoption tax credit, and 70 percent of the adoptive families faced at least a partial audit. Only a minuscule percentage of the tax credits given to those families were disallowed. Many needy families saw their returns delayed for months. We also found out this year that hundreds of conservative nonprofits had their applications for tax-exempt status delayed for months and years by IRS agents.

Ask millions of small business owners who have spent hours laboring over tax returns—the government doesn't

typically operate by the honor system, but when it comes to doling out billions of dollars in new ObamaCare subsidies, the government is just going to accept applications without question, on the honor system.

This is all in the interest of getting ObamaCare up and running as soon as possible without any regard to potential fraud, and it's after the old "pay and chase" model. We are entrusted with protecting taxpayer dollars, not watching them go out to people who don't need them. If the Treasury Department can't figure out how to prevent fraud, then subsidies shouldn't be going out the door. And if the tax subsidy is overpaid to the insurance companies for the tax credits for individuals, guess who pays back the overpayment? It's not the insurance companies. It comes out of the individual's pocket.

I'm sure I won't be the only person on the floor today to recall President Reagan's words of "trust, but verify." The byword for ObamaCare is just simply "trust." The Obama administration doesn't trust adoptive parents or conservative nonprofits or small businesses; but for the purpose of getting the President's signature legislation up and running, they are perfectly willing to see taxpayers get fleeced. This is simply wrong. We need to demand that the administration follow the law. ObamaCare was such a landmark piece of legislation. Why does it have to be ignored at every turn?

I urge Members to support the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), a member of our committee.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you very much, Mr. PALLONE, for yielding time this morning, and thank you for your extraordinary leadership on our committee and for giving affordable health care to every American.

Madam Speaker, I rise this morning to oppose H.R. 2775. This bill, if passed by the House and passed by the Senate and signed by the President, which I would say is highly unlikely, would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to certify to Congress that an income verification system is in place before any subsidies can be distributed for individuals to purchase health insurance through the marketplace.

Here you go again—repeal effort No. 41.

The Republican majority is obsessed with discrediting the President of the United States by using every procedural maneuver imaginable to weaken this law, which was passed by the Congress and upheld by the United States Supreme Court.

I invite my Republican colleagues to read a report published by the Congressional Budget Office, which states that HHS already has in place sufficient safeguards for distributing subsidies to assist uninsured Americans with the purchase of insurance.

This is not an honor system, Mr. PITTS. It is written into the law, and the Congressional Budget Office recognizes that we do have in place a system to verify the incomes.

Madam Speaker, I am still fuming about the 15 Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee who on August 29 sent a multi-page investigatory letter to 51 community nonprofits that have been approved to receive navigator grants to assist the uninsured with the process. I simply do not understand how the chairman of a committee and a few like-minded committee members can author a letter to grant recipients, demanding that they answer questions and produce documents. I suggest that this letter exceeds the authority of these individuals to harass and to intimidate grant recipients.

I urge the Republican majority to stop trying to discredit President Obama. Stop trying to defund and repeal the Affordable Care Act. It is the law of the land. Millions of Americans are benefiting from it today and will be in the future. You should be using this creativity and energy expended this morning to pass a budget and lift the sequester, which is hurting families and communities all across America.

My friends, get serious; and let's stop playing games with the American people.

Mrs. ELLMERS. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlelady.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend Mrs. BLACK, my colleague from Tennessee. She has done a tremendous job in bringing this legislation forward, and she brings it forward because of the experience we have had in Tennessee with a program that was called TennCare, which had no verification. It became "just in time" insurance, and guess what? It became too expensive to afford. When you do not exercise appropriate oversight and verification, that is what happens—you incentivize the use. Those who really do not qualify come into the program. Indeed, we had a Governor—a Democrat Governor by the way—who removed about 300,000 individuals from this program.

I am pleased that as we discuss and stand in support of H.R. 2775 that my colleagues across the aisle are getting our message. When it comes to ObamaCare, yes, delay, defund, repeal, replace. That is exactly what we want to do because this law has become so amazingly unpopular with the American people and, indeed, with women. Over 65 percent of all American women oppose this law and the implementation of this law.

The reason we are bringing this legislation forward is that there is a gaping hole. We know that having self-attestation for getting these taxpayer subsidies in these exchanges is going to lead to an incredible amount of fraud.

We are even having estimates of as much as \$250 billion worth of fraud, which could be going into this program. We're not acting on theory. We're looking at what has previously happened with programs such as TennCare. Indeed, my colleague from New Jersey has heard me talk about this for years, and he knows that when we look at something that is public option health care that that is the public option from which we draw our experience.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs), who is a long-time supporter and person in the mix on health care, certainly as a nurse and as a health care professional.

Mrs. CAPPs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, my friend from New Jersey.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. Our Nation is facing a host of challenges: we need to end the sequester; we need to fund our government properly to avoid a shutdown; we need to increase the deficit limit so that we can pay our bills and maintain a strong credit rating; and we must have a full and open debate about what to do in response to chemical weapons being used in Syria.

But instead of any of these pressing issues, here we are again, at the insistence of the House majority, voting for the 41st time to repeal, defund, obstruct, or derail the Affordable Care Act; and they want to do so as more and more Americans, including my constituents on the central coast of California, are now beginning to benefit from the law.

Already 11,000 young adults in my district have gained health care insurance coverage under their parents' plans, allowing them to pursue their education or to start new ventures without the fear of going bankrupt if they should get sick. Almost 300,000 of my constituents are now able to get the preventative health services they need without worrying about the cost, and 10,000 seniors have already found relief when falling into the dreaded prescription drug doughnut hole in Medicare; and in less than 1 month, California families who for so long have been priced out or denied coverage in the private health insurance market will finally get the coverage they want and deserve.

Throughout the program—we call it Covered California Exchange—along with health care at marketplaces all across this country, individuals, families and small businesses will gain a transparent, one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies. They will also be able to receive financial assistance and to sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage; and they won't have to worry about being denied coverage for their preexisting conditions. Yet this bill before us would erode all of these benefits, essentially blocking hardworking families from getting the affordable health insurance coverage they need.

The American people have moved on. They want us to come together to improve our Nation, not to divide it. So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill. Let's get to work on the many critical issues facing our Nation.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Washington, Congresswoman MCMORRIS RODGERS, the chair of our Republican Conference.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I thank the gentlelady.

Madam Speaker, in less than a month, enrollment for ObamaCare's largest entitlement program will begin. Subsidies will go out the door on January 1, and they will go to anyone who claims he is eligible—no verification, no accountability. The GAO and the Inspectors General for both Health and Human Services and the IRS have told us that the administration's verification system is extremely vulnerable to fraud, but the picture gets worse.

In 2012 alone, Health and Human Services gave out more than \$64 billion in improper payments. In fact, the Department of Health and Human Services, the agency charged with implementing these exchanges, has the highest annual improper payment rate among Federal agencies. The Department of the Treasury, which is responsible for enforcing 47 different tax provisions, is second only to Health and Human Services. The Wall Street Journal recently reported that not verifying eligibility could cost taxpayers more than \$250 billion in improper payments. Yet the administration doesn't seem to care.

Over the last several months, we've seen the wheels falling off—the delay in the employer mandate, the delay in the consumer cost containment rule, the delay in the finalizing of agreements with insurance plans, and now this delay in ensuring that the verification mechanisms are in place to protect taxpayers. This administration has made one thing clear, that it will stop at nothing to ensure that 7 million people are enrolled in exchanges in 2014—2.7 million of whom must be young in order to make it work—and that subsidies are handed out to as many Americans as possible.

□ 0945

The administration's decision to allow enrollees to self-attest to the information provided to the exchanges is not only irresponsible, but ripe for fraud. The only real solution is the passage of H.R. 2775, and I urge our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this is sort of a charade that's going on today. Our Republican friends allow, for example, businesses to self-certify in a whole range of other areas. This is not about that. What this is, is another attempt to sabotage health care reform.

America is involved in a grand reform. Some of us are in States like Oregon, California, Washington, New York, and Maryland where we're actually working to implement the reform, and our citizens are going to have lower rates, more choices, and subsidies for individuals and small businesses for better coverage.

In other parts of the country some of our Republican friends have decided to sabotage implementation. Customers won't get extra help in Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, or Wyoming, where insurance commissioners won't even review health plans to make sure that they're offered in the new marketplaces to provide consumers with required benefits and protections. In Missouri, believe it or not, the Republican legislature has made it illegal for new health insurance marketplaces for State employees to tell people what they're eligible for. Today, this is one more effort to throw sand in the gears.

The response from Republicans, who have no vision for health care, refuses to acknowledge that what we are working on now and what they derisively call ObamaCare, actually had its roots in a bipartisan consensus of what's necessary to get more value out of American health care.

The health care reform train has left the station. We should simply reject today this misguided attempt to sabotage it. Americans from coast to coast will be able to see the difference in communities that are embracing it and implementing it versus those that are trying to sabotage it.

In the course of the next 2 years, the facts will be clear. Mercifully, what the House is going to pass today is not going to be enacted into law, and the rest of us can get to work implementing reform.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds just to outline some of the things that have already been repealed in ObamaCare.

As a consequence of Congress passing ObamaCare to find out what is in it, we have found some terrible ideas in the law. To date, the President has actually signed into law seven bipartisan bills repealing or defunding parts of the health care law. H.R. 4 repealed the small business paperwork mandate, or the 1099. H.R. 1473 cut \$2.2 billion from a stealth public plan and froze the IRS budget. H.R. 674 saved taxpayers \$13 billion by adjusting eligibility for ObamaCare programs. H.R. 2055 made more cuts to CO-OPs, IPAB, and the IRS. H.R. 3630 slashed billions from ObamaCare slush funds. I could go on, Madam Chairwoman.

Now I would like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman PAT MEEHAN.

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the No Subsidies Without Verification Act, legislation of which I'm a proud cosponsor. October 1 is only days away, and almost every day we see a brand new headline about ObamaCare, demonstrating the

"train wreck," as one Senator put it. Those are their words, not mine.

The thousands of rules, regulations, and mandates are only increasing the cost of health insurance and dramatically expanding the bureaucracy in our health care. And the implementation of ObamaCare has been one disaster after another.

Buried in the hundreds of pages of regulations that have been released this summer was a rule change announcing that the government will no longer verify whether applicants for ObamaCare's insurance exchange are actually qualified for the aid. Instead, they will simply rely on the honor system.

Madam Speaker, we're talking about billions of dollars here. How can we possibly be relying on an honor system? According to *The Wall Street Journal*, it's estimated that not verifying the eligibility could result in approximately \$250 billion in fraudulent payments.

The No Subsidies Without Verification Act will stop any taxpayer funding subsidies until an accurate real-time verification system is in place to ensure the applicants are indeed eligible. It seems like common sense to me. We need a trusted system in place to stop any waste, fraud, and abuse resulting from not verifying eligibility for ObamaCare insurance subsidies.

This is being operated through a data hub, which will have millions of persons' personally identifying information. Of most concern, this is going to be a honeypot for identity theft and the very purpose for which it was put in place in the first place. This income verification is not capable of being accurately done because this administration has refused to allow the businesses who will give the information to apply.

I am a proud cosponsor, and I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

I rise today to ask an incredulous question of how many times do we have to say, "No," and how many times do the American people have to say, "Take your hands off my good Affordable Care Act" that has allowed millions of Americans to have preventable care that is being poised to attack the scandalous high percentage of uninsured in the State of Texas, being the number one State with uninsured persons? How many times?

First of all, this bill is frivolous. The reason is because there is a construct in the Affordable Care Act to deal with all of the questions that they've asked. First of all, it will require that individuals will have to submit their projected annual household income. All income data submitted through the marketplace will then be checked against IRS data, Social Security data, current wage information. If there is inconsistent

ency, the marketplace will require additional documentation. In addition, marketplaces will check employer coverage information from the applicant and their employer against data, OPM, and the SHOP Marketplaces, as well as other data sources.

It is absolutely absurd for this bill to place more responsibilities on an already sequestered government. If my colleagues want to do anything to provide any substance to what they're talking about, let's put a bill on the floor to end sequestration. There's no resources that would add to the inspector general's ability to do all that they said.

Let me add further insult to injury, and I want my constituents to listen closely. \$67 million was given to navigators to provide the kind of oversight and construction that these individuals on this bill have suggested they need. What I find appalling and what I've not seen in my tenure in Congress is the number of Members on the Energy and Commerce Committee that have sent a letter to the 51 navigators governed by Health and Human Services to require them to send information.

I want my navigator that received a grant from HHS to refuse to do anything with that letter, and I'm going to ask the Secretary of HHS to reject this letter that has no authority in law. Again, it is trying to abuse and reject the idea of the Affordable Care Act.

This bill should go down, and don't answer the letter. This is a bad way to deal with health care in America.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2775, the so-called "No Subsidies Without Verification Act." I oppose this unnecessary and dilatory legislation which imposes unnecessary and burdensome conditions on the ability of Americans to utilize the tax credits provided by the Affordable Care Act which will enable them to purchase affordable health insurance for themselves and their families.

This is the 41st attempt by House Republicans to repeal, delay, or undermine effective implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

Even though the Affordable Care Act, which has been upheld by the Supreme Court and is here to stay, House Republicans refuse to abandon their quixotic quest to derail a law that will bring peace of mind to millions of Americans and reduce the deficit by \$1 trillion.

Their latest attempt is the bill before us which prohibits any health insurance premium tax credits from being provided until the HHS Inspector General Office certifies there is a program in place that "successfully and consistently verifies" household income and coverage requirements for those applying for these credits.

This bill, H.R. 2775, is unnecessary because HHS already has a strong income verification system in place, as confirmed by CBO. The only purpose of this legislation is to hinder the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

The impact of the enactment of this GOP bill would be an unconscionable delay in obtaining health insurance for more than 25.7 million Americans, 22.7 million of whom are members of working class families.

The new requirement imposed by the irresponsible bill before us would delay millions of

our hard-working constituents from getting the premium tax credits they are clearly eligible for beginning on January 1, 2014.

Madam Speaker, Americans do not have to be told that justice delayed is justice denied!

Under current law, to receive the premium tax credits to make their health insurance affordable, individuals will have to submit their projected annual household income. All income data submitted through the Marketplaces will then be checked against IRS data, Social Security data, and current wage information. If there is an inconsistency, the Marketplaces will require additional documentation from applicants.

In addition, Marketplaces will check employer coverage information from the applicant and their employer against data from OPM and the SHOP Marketplaces as well as other data sources approved by HHS to verify eligibility for the tax credits. If applicant information and other data do not match, the Marketplaces will ask for further supporting documentation.

Further, all payments of premium tax credits are reconciled by IRS the following year. The income data submitted is reconciled against the actual wages and health coverage information on the individual's income tax return. If there is an inconsistency, the applicant pays back the excess, subject to statutory limit and there is 100 percent income verification and reconciliation on this back-end.

In sum, there are ample existing safeguards to ensure that premium tax credits are available only to those eligible to receive them.

Madam Speaker, after the sobering events of the last week, regarding war and peace, I would hope all my colleagues would take into consideration the importance of using our limited legislative time more wisely.

We should be addressing the need to eliminate sequestration, raising the debt ceiling and passing the jobs bill in order to repair infrastructure. But instead House Republicans continue to repeal, delay, or undermine the Affordable Care Act. Instead of wasting time on these time-consuming but futile efforts, our friends across the aisle should join with their Democratic colleagues to work together to create jobs and educational opportunities for our people.

Moreover, the Affordable Care Act is working and my constituents—and those of my colleagues—are benefiting from this landmark legislation.

Many of those most in need of the healthcare coverage provided by the Affordable Care Act live in the districts of many members on both sides of this argument. My home state of Texas leads the list of states with the highest percentages of uninsured residents. The states with the highest percentage of uninsured are:

1. Texas: 28.8%.
2. Louisiana: 24%.
3. Nevada: 23.3%.
4. California: 23.2%.
5. Florida: 22.8%.
6. Georgia: 22.5%.
7. Arkansas: 21.9%.
8. Mississippi: 21.7%.
9. Oklahoma: 21.4%.

The highest concentration of the uninsured is the poor. The Affordable Care Act provides at no or nearly no cost to states an option to enroll those living in or near poverty into their Medicaid program, which would benefit my

state of Texas tremendously if the Governor can be persuaded to follow the example of his Republican counterparts and accept a deal of a lifetime.

I cannot understand the continued refusal by House Republicans to accept the Affordable Care Act, which is now the law of the land and is modeled after the plan put in place in Massachusetts by the nominee of their party in the last presidential election.

Instead of focusing on the issues that the American people want addressed, we are having the same discussion to repeal the Affordable Care Act in efforts of my colleagues to repeal, obstruct and undermine this law.

What is even more frustrating is that while there is so much energy in trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act, there has been no plan or suggestions posed on how to replace it.

Additionally, I oppose this misguided legislation because the Affordable Care Act is working for America and for my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas. Let me count the ways:

13 million Americans benefited from \$1.1 billion in rebates sent to them from their health insurance companies last year.

105 million Americans have access to free preventive services, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors on Medicare.

Millions of women began receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive services in August 2012.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage.

Nearly 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers.

6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 have health insurance through their parents' plan, half of whom would be uninsured without this coverage.

6.3 million Seniors in the 'donut hole' have already saved \$6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 small employers have already taken advantage of the Small Business Health Care Tax Credit to provide health insurance to 2 million workers.

Because of the Affordable Care Act 3.8 million people in Texas—including 2.2 million seniors on Medicare now receive preventative care services. Over 7 million Texans no longer have to fear lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance. Texas parents of 300,731 young adults can sleep easier at night knowing that their children can remain on their health insurance until age 26.

The protection provided by this law is a guarantee to 5 million Texas residents that their insurance companies will spend 80 percent of their premium dollars on healthcare, or customers will get a rebate from their insurance company.

In my state, there are 4,029 people who had no insurance because of pre-existing conditions, but today the Affordable Care Act has provided them with access to coverage. The Affordable Care Act means that many Texans are free of worry about having access to healthcare insurance.

The Affordable Care Act has helped my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas tremendously. Because of the Affordable Care Act:

11,400 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan;

Over 4,100 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth \$5.4 million, an average discount of \$600 per person in 2011, \$650 in 2012, and \$1,040 thus far in 2013;

71,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible;

121,000 individuals in the district—including 23,000 children and 50,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible;

113,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20 percent of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections;

Over 31,100 consumers in the district received approximately \$4.4 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of \$95 per family in 2012 and \$187 per family in 2011;

Up to 46,000 children in the district with pre-existing health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers;

153,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014;

Up to 193,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a pre-existing health condition; and

The 17,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

However, the list of benefits from the Affordable Care Act is not complete. In 2014, when the Affordable Care Act's final provisions will become effective, insurance companies will be banned from: discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition; charging higher rates based on gender or health status; enforcing lifetime dollar limits; and enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

In 2014, access to affordable healthcare for the self employed or those who decide to purchase their own coverage will be easier because of Affordable Insurance Exchanges. There will be a one-stop marketplace where consumers can do what Federal employees have done for decades—purchase insurance at reasonable rates from an insurer of their choice. This will ensure that health care consumers get the care that they need from the medical professionals they trust most at a price they can afford.

This Congress has work that needs to be done, and it is work that should be taken up to restore workers, their families, and communities to sound economic health. We do not have time for partisan political games that do not advance the interests of the American people.

With less than 20 days before enrollment in the Marketplaces begins, the last thing we should be doing is considering legislation that serves no purpose other than to delay affordable health care coverage to millions of Americans who need and deserve the security and peace of mind such coverage brings.

I urge my Colleagues to put partisan politics aside and join me in voting no on the passage of this bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, August 29, 2013.

DEAR —: Pursuant to Rules X and XI of the United States House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is examining the role Navigators will play in efforts to enroll individuals in health insurance exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA).

On August 15, 2013, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) awarded \$67 million in Navigator Cooperative Agreements to entities that will assist consumers in preparing electronic and paper applications to establish eligibility and enroll in coverage through the PPACA marketplaces. Your organization was identified as a recipient of a Navigator grant by the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight (CCIIO).¹

In order to better understand the work you will perform as a Navigator and the consumer protections that will be in place before open enrollment begins on October 1, 2013, we ask that you contact Committee staff to schedule a briefing to occur no later than September 13, 2013, to discuss your participation as a Navigator in the health insurance exchanges. We also ask that you provide written answers to the following questions and produce the materials requested no later than September 13, 2013:

1. Provide a written description of the work that will be performed with the funds obtained via your Navigator grant. This would include a description of the number of employees, volunteers, or representatives that will be utilized and the pay and duties for each, as well as a written description of how any other portion of the grant may be spent. If a budget or detailed description of how this funding will be utilized exists or will be created, provide these documents in addition to the written response requested.

2. Provide a written description of the training or education employees, volunteers, or representatives must complete, including training or education required by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), CMS, CCIIO, or any other federal or state entity. Provide a written description of any training or educational efforts employees, volunteers, or representatives must complete that are required by your organization beyond that required by any federal or state entity. Provide copies of these materials.

3. Provide a written description of the processes and procedures in place to monitor, review, or otherwise supervise your employees, volunteers, or representatives. If documentation of these standards exists or will be created, provide these documents in addition to the written response requested.

4. Provide a written description of how your organization will utilize the information obtained during performance of your Navigator grant. This would include, but is not limited to, descriptions of the measures your organization will take to safeguard an individual's personal and medical information. Furthermore, provide a written description of whether your organization may use any of the information obtained during performance of your Navigator grant, including any prohibitions on the use of that information. For example, please provide a written description of whether your organization may contact individuals who have utilized your services as a Navigator for the purposes of fundraising, voter registration efforts, campaign activities, or any other reason.

5. Provide a written description of whether your organization has been contacted by any health insurance company or health care provider to discuss your Navigator grant. This would include, but is not limited to, discussions of supporting your organization in any way or promoting the health insurance company or health care provider to individuals your organization may contact.

6. Provide all documentation and communications related to your Navigator grant. This would include, but is not limited to, materials your organization submitted in order to obtain the grant, materials provided to your organization upon obtaining the grant, and communications between your organization and representatives from HHS, CMS, CCIIO or any other federal or state entity. This request also includes, but is not limited to, any documents provided by (or communications with), representatives from HHS, CMS, CCIIO, Enroll America, or any other entity including federal or state governments discussing individuals to target or solicit for enrollment under the PPACA, including discussions or documents related to geographic area.

Instructions for responding to the Committee's document request are included as an attachment to this letter. Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. If you have questions or wish to discuss your responses or production, please contact Karen Christian or Sean Hayes.

Sincerely,

Fred Upton, Chairman; Tim Murphy, Chairman, Marsha Blackburn, Vice Chairman; Phil Gingrey; Gregg Harper; Cory Gardner; Joe Barton, Chairman Emeritus; Joseph R. Pitts, Chairman, Subcommittee on Health; Michael C. Burgess, Vice Chairman, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations; Steve Scalise; Pete Olson; Morgan Griffith; Bill Johnson; Renee Ellmers; Billy Long.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to point out to my colleagues across the aisle that in the latest Wall Street Journal article of September 10, one of the things that they point out again is that in the Senate, which is the Democrat majority, they put in an HHS spending bill a sense of the Senate that the provision for income verification be in place.

This is something that is very important. It is common sense. Madam Speaker, wouldn't it be just a major commonsense issue to just simply put in place a proactive prevention of fraud, waste, and abuse?

I would also like to point out to my colleagues that have discussed the issue of whether or not the inspector general has the ability to do so, first and foremost, we wouldn't be approaching this in this manner if the rule had not been removed. Yet, we have to have a system in place that will address these issues.

There is no reason that we can't approach it from this, again, very commonsense approach where we ask that we actually have a rule put in place. We can't simply move forward on this incredible disaster of a law when we are not asking for some verification. I think it's a very simple move. I think it's a very commonsense move.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. I now yield 3 minutes to the chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. DINGELL.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, here we go again. Time in the House is being wasted. The business of the Nation is being obfuscated. The Republicans have got more nonsense to put on the floor.

We're told that this is important. That's baloney. This is the 41st time that the Republicans have tried to gut the Affordable Care Act. They don't understand that you're supposed to respect the will of the people and to carry forward the business of the Nation. What a shame that we have such behavior on that side of the aisle.

All Members agree that we have to verify the incomes of those getting subsidies through the marketplaces, and that is exactly what will take place starting on October 1. This is obfuscation and deceit. All income data will be submitted through the marketplaces and will be checked against data from both the IRS and the Social Security Administration under existing practices. This is a lot of witchcraft and baloney. If there is an inconsistency, then additional documentation is going to be required. Furthermore, all the subsidies are reconciled by the IRS when an individual files their tax returns.

This is just spinning by people who don't want the legislation to come to be, and again, this is the 41st time we've engaged in this silly exercise.

The practical impact of this bill is to deny millions of Americans from getting subsidies for purchasing health insurance. Its purpose is to delay and obfuscate the implementation of the legislation that it is supposed to be helping. To pass this bill is simply going to prove to be a malicious assault on the most vulnerable people in our country and those most in need of the Affordable Care Act.

We've seen this song and dance before. As I mentioned, this is the 41st time we've engaged in this nonsense, wasting about \$1.5 million each hour we're doing this. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 2775. This is political gimmickry. It is going to have harmful effects, and it is intended to do so.

I urge that the legislation be rejected and that we stop this nonsense and we get going forward to try to see to it that we do implement, in a proper way, the Affordable Care Act.

I thank my good friend New Jersey for yielding this time to me, and I urge my colleagues to reject this nonsense.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to some of the comments from my esteemed colleague.

This is theory. That's basically what we have now, because, as the rule was removed the week of the Fourth of July, there has been no rule put in place to replace it. Basically what we're hearing is the description of how it would be run if the rule were in place.

Mr. Speaker, an August 5 frequently asked question document was given out by HHS and the administration, which basically explains the verify process of the Federal exchange but outlines no details on how it will occur. Additionally, this fact sheet has no force of law. Even worse, the fact sheet doesn't even pretend to address the verification applications submitted to ObamaCare exchanges administered by the States. It simply says that the State can choose whatever sample size it wants to audit, meaning no actual verification may occur before millions of dollars of taxpayer-financed benefits are paid out.

□ 1000

While I believe America is a Nation of honorable people, we have to remember there are always those who will abuse the system. The fact sheet from CMS doesn't change the status of the rule. States can continue to audit whatever sample size they see fit or simply not audit at all.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this unnecessary piece of legislation.

Thank you for the time to speak. The bill before us is unnecessary. It is burdensome and serves as a barrier for those who are qualified to receive the care they need. Health and Human Services (HHS), the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and the marketplaces are equipped to handle income verification. If people lie on their tax forms, that is a federal crime.

This is nothing more than one more attempt to block implementation of this law. The Republicans know that as implementation moves ahead their exaggerations and their fear mongering will be exposed. This is a desperate, last ditch effort to stop millions of qualified individuals and families from being able to access care by holding back any subsidies until unreasonable requirements are met by HHS. We have controls in place. The marketplaces and the IRS are tasked with reconciling the data they receive. Americans who are eligible for subsidies should receive them and this bill prevents it from happening.

The Affordable Care Act is a critical law but it's not a perfect law. However, we are spending time with 11th hour attempts at thwarting the law of the land, upheld by the Supreme Court, rather than spending time helping our

constituents navigate the new health landscape.

I oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New Jersey for yielding, and I'm glad he's back with us.

The purpose of this bill is to make it as hard as possible for a hardworking person to get health insurance for their family. So somewhere in America today there's a person working in a nursing home or a retail store or driving a schoolbus, and if their children got sick tonight, they could not take them to a hospital with an insurance card in their pocket; they'd have to pay for it whatever way they could, which is not at all.

The new law says that that person, under most circumstances, starting October 1, can sign up for a health insurance policy as good as the ones that Members of Congress have, for a reasonable and affordable price, maybe \$30 or \$40 a week for that family. This is not someone on public assistance. This is not someone sitting around watching someone else pay their bills. This is a hardworking, taxpaying American. That person has to report their income. They have to follow the rules and do all the things that are needed to be done. This bill makes it as hard as possible for that person to do that, and that's why it should be defeated.

So here we are again. This is attempt number—what number are we using today—44, 45, 46, whatever the number is. The government is going to shut down on September 30 if we don't pass a budget. The majority said it was going to bring that budget to the floor this morning, but they're not doing that. Instead, we're having attempt number 44 to repeal the Affordable Care Act. This is not only a waste of the country's time, it's an imposition on hardworking people who finally deserve a break after all these years.

Vote "no" on this unwise piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close. I would like to ask my colleague if he has any further speakers remaining?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the remaining 30 seconds to our Ways and Means Committee time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Here in Washington we have a way of doing things, and one of those ways is to deal with problems after they've been created.

Prior to coming to Washington, I was a nurse for many, many years. One of the rules that we had drummed into our heads was, if it's not documented, it did not happen. This is a rule that is not documented, so it will not happen. It is not enough that we simply ask to be on the honor system. This is a very important piece of legislation. We must ensure the hard-earned taxpayer dollars are protected and abuses are avoided. I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2775 for this purpose. I believe it is incumbent on the American people and the job that we do here in Washington to ensure that this happens.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) has 10 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 10½ minutes.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of the No Subsidies Without Verification Act because too many of our precious tax dollars are being lost to fraud. That's the simple goal of this bill by Representative DIANE BLACK, stopping fraud and abuse in ObamaCare.

We wouldn't allow an individual to apply for a mortgage, a car loan or a credit card without verifying their income. You can't go into a restaurant, grocery store, or gasoline station and just pay on the honor system. Yet today—because the White House, frankly, has botched the last 3½ years, and ObamaCare is still not ready—somehow they believe that it's okay for billions of dollars in new taxpayer subsidies to go out the door without a bat of the eye on the honor system.

As hard as you work to earn every paycheck, how much more fraud in health care can we accept? Today we have the opportunity, and I think the responsibility, to hold the Federal Government's feet to the fire and insist it put in place strong protections that will end this pay first and chase later model that's been so ineffective at stopping fraud.

This bill simply insists that the independent inspector general of the Health and Human Services agency certifies there is a real, genuine program in place to stop fraud and abuse in ObamaCare by stopping taxpayer subsidies from going out the door to those who aren't eligible. Wow, that's radical in Washington—not paying those who aren't eligible.

This will give American taxpayers some assurance that we're protecting their hard-earned tax dollars. President Obama has admitted in ObamaCare it's not ready for businesses, and so he waived that. Everyone knows it's not ready for families and workers either. Is it asking too much to at least insist that it be ready to protect taxpayers against a mountain of more fraud?

Now, the White House and our Democratic friends tell us, trust us, we'll

verify everything before giving out taxpayer subsidies. Really? This is from the same White House that said exchanges may accept the applicant's attestation without further verification. This is from the same Health and Human Services agency that had to backtrack and explain maybe they would audit all of the applications, but not for State exchanges; they're on their own.

Sorry, but I'm not buying it, and nor are taxpayers in my State of Texas. Time and time again, Health and Human Services and the White House have ducked the real details about ObamaCare. They have no real plan in place. Meanwhile, taxpayer subsidies will fly out the door as individuals pinky swear that their income is accurate.

Only Members of Congress who refuse to stop fraud, who enjoy wasting taxpayer dollars, and who want to turn a blind eye to wasted money could oppose this bill. I strongly urge a "yes" vote on this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

So why are we going through the motions once again—I guess 41 times now? Because the health care reform train is rolling. It's picking up momentum, and the Republicans are once again trying to throw a monkey wrench in its way. In Michigan, 14 different insurance entities are competing. Tens and tens of organizations are working to make this work. Medicaid is now available. Republicans see this happening, and they just can't stand the thought.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) who has really led the effort to stop fraud and abuse in ObamaCare and who understands health care herself.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As Members of the people's House, protecting the American taxpayer from fraud and abuse is absolutely a critical part of our job. And if, like me, you spent the last few weeks visiting your constituents, you will know that the American people are fed up and they're tired of footing the bill for Washington's failures. That's why passing the No Subsidies Without Verification Act is so important.

This bill would protect American taxpayers from the staggering amount of fraud and abuse in ObamaCare exchanges by simply requiring that ObamaCare live up to its original guarantee in their original law that only those who certify to be eligible for taxpayer subsidies receive them. Unfortunately, because of this administration's clandestine rule change on the July 4 holiday, this is not currently the case. It is estimated that as much as \$50 billion of hard-earned American taxpayer dollars could be given out in fraudulent ObamaCare subsidy claims.

Protecting the taxpayers' money is not a partisan issue. The health care

law was originally written—yes, was originally written—so that only those who qualify would receive Federal subsidies in the exchanges. And the Democratic controlled Senate Appropriations Committee has passed legislation expressing their sense that verification needs to occur before subsidies are doled out.

I urge my colleagues here in the House today to join me in helping to protect the American taxpayer, and I call on the Senate to bring this for a vote so that we can send a common-sense measure to the President and protect the American taxpayer from fraud and abuse.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be managed by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time to speak against this bill.

The American public should know what this bill is all about. It is the 41st attempt in the House to repeal and confuse the American people about the Affordable Care Act. It's a deliberate distortion of the actions that have already been in place to protect the taxpayers.

We have letters from the Department of Health and Human Services as well as the Congressional Budget Office that the verification system is in place so that taxpayers' money is being protected.

But the message that the Republicans have been sending over and over again is that we should delay, defund, repeal, but never replace the Affordable Care Act. If they needed further evidence to ignore, just yesterday the nonpartisan CBO reported that HHS has already put the verification system in place that their bill suggests we do. Mr. Speaker, what they want to do is to create a duplicative, unworkable process to certify a verification system, and they want to give it to the inspector general of HHS, but the Inspector General's Office has told us that they have no idea what this bill is proposing or what that office would have to do. They have no experience in doing it.

So this is not a credible bill. It's a political bill. They can't repeal the Affordable Care Act, so they're determined to keep it from working. It's a clear effort to delay the implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

When I was home, my constituents, particularly those who are looking forward to the legislation going into effect, people who have had preexisting conditions or inability to get insurance in the past, keep on asking me: Is this really going to happen, or are the Republicans going to stop it?

I urge a "no" vote on this bill because it's another effort by the Republicans to stop health care for all Americans.

□ 1015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the head of the Republican Policy Committee, and a leader in health care.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, this administration's been very proud of the work that they have done to reduce fraud in Medicare, that they have done to reduce fraud in durable medical equipment. Just a couple of weeks ago there was a huge bust in Puerto Rico trying to deal with Social Security disability fraud that has happened there for years.

But for whatever reason, they have chosen, on this piece of legislation, to look the other way, to actually turn away and say we're going to allow people to self-verify whether they're eligible for the subsidies, when right now people don't even know if they're eligible for the subsidies.

If I walked up to 100 people on the street today and asked them the two questions on that—does your employer provide you a qualified health plan—most of them would say: I have no idea. What's a qualified health plan?

And then if I said, Do you qualify for the subsidies?, just about every American would say: I don't know. I have no idea.

Yet, they're being asked, when no one knows right now, to self-verify that you know one way or the other. They don't have the information. They don't know the information. We don't even know what's going to happen on the exchanges yet. That's not been released yet, and it starts in 3 weeks.

So to say to people something that doesn't even exist yet, you've got to be able to say whether you certify for it or not, whether you can say that, yes, I do qualify for, this is absurd.

We're just asking the simple question: Shouldn't we stick with the original plan on this if we're going to do this?

The law itself said that it had to be certified. Then they created a waiver out of thin air and said, no, this is going to be too complicated; we're going to delay that for a while.

Then people say, what's your plan?

I can tell you, my State is begging to keep our own plan for Insure Oklahoma. We're having to go back to the Federal Government and request that we can keep the plan we've had for a while taking care of those in poverty. This is absurd.

There is a straightforward, simple way to do this that can be done; but, instead, we've created this convoluted mess.

Just this morning I've heard people on the other side say that the train has left the station on this. I've heard health care reform, that train is rolling.

Well, I can tell you, in the Senate the Democrats are saying, at least some of them are saying, this is a train wreck. And I agree.

The train has left the station, and if we don't step out and say this has to stop, then we'll continue to have more and more fraud. We have got to take this on and take it on right now.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD four documents. One is a letter from the President, in his opposition to the bill. The second is technical assistance from the Inspector General, saying they have no ability to do this. The third is a cost estimate from CBO, and the fourth is a letter from HHS detailing their verification plans.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 10, 2013.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2775—NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION
ACT

(Rep. Black, R-TN, and 103 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 2775 because the goal of the bill is already being accomplished while the text of the bill would create delays that could cost millions of hard-working middle-class families the security of affordable health coverage and care they deserve. It is time for the Congress to stop fighting old political battles and join the President in an agenda focused on providing greater economic opportunity and security for middle class families and all those working to get into the middle-class.

The Affordable Care Act gives people greater control over their own health care and has already improved many aspects of the Nation's health care system. Beginning in October 2013, millions of low- and middle-income Americans will be eligible to receive tax credits to help them purchase insurance and cost-sharing reductions to help with out-of-pocket expenses for coverage effective January 1, 2014. Tens of millions of Americans who have previously been denied coverage due to a pre-existing medical condition will now be covered. The nearly one in two Americans under the age of 65 with pre-existing medical conditions will have the peace of mind that comes from knowing that they cannot be dropped from their health plan or denied coverage because of those conditions. House passage of H.R. 2775 would undermine this security by delaying tax credits and cost-sharing reductions that will otherwise be provided to millions of Americans.

H.R. 2775 is unnecessary because the Secretary of Health and Human Services has already put in place an effective and efficient system for verification of eligibility for premium tax credits and cost sharing reductions. Moreover, it would create vague standards for the Inspector General, whose office has never performed this type of prospective review, to "successfully and consistently" verify eligibility. As a result, this legislation's unnecessary pre-certification requirement would impede opening the Marketplaces on October 1, 2013, driving up out-of-pocket health care costs for millions of Americans and reducing timely access to much-needed and long-denied affordable coverage.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2775, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

We offer the following technical assistance on draft HR 2775, as amended, as requested. We note that this technical assistance represents the views of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) and does not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)/the Administration.

Page 2, line 13, as amended by the amendment: The draft legislation would require the IG to make a certification to Congress. We are uncertain what Congress means by a certification. The certification function described in the legislation is substantially outside a traditional OIG oversight role. There is no generally accepted auditing definition or standard for a "certification", nor are certifications of the type described in the legislation among the types of work articulated under the IG Act.

The legislation can be read as contemplating a prospective certification occurring before the program starts operations (or, if operations have begun, before the program has been operational long enough for a statistically sound review of actual operations; typically, we require more than three months of data). As an OIG using accepted auditing and oversight standards, it is difficult to predict whether programs will, in fact, work as intended. More traditionally, an OIG might review internal controls and make recommendations to strengthen them if needed; conduct statistically-valid, retrospective reviews of actual operational history; or issue an opinion on design controls. These options may be more effective for oversight of the verification program.

Page 2, line 14, as amended by the amendment: We note that the "successfully and consistently" standard articulated in the amendment is a standard without clear meaning from an audit perspective. It is not clear to us how this standard would intersect with Yellow Book standards.

General comment on the legislation, as amended: While we are not entirely clear about the scope and nature of the work contemplated by the drafters, under any interpretation of this draft legislation, the OIG would need to develop additional programmatic and technical expertise in a new program area and would need resources. Given the potential scope of the work described in the draft legislation, the apparent timeframe contemplated, and the serious implications of not completing the work on an expedited basis, we would need substantial additional resources, including auditors, contractors, or other staff. If the certification were to cover multiple systems (including the Federal and State-based exchanges) or require auditing of complex operations, we might need dozens of staff to do the work in the time allotted. To do the certification proposed in the legislation, or the alternative internal controls review and retrospective reviews of operations in accordance with OIG's historic oversight role,—as well as other essential oversight of ACA—we need OIG's 2014 budget appropriated.

H.R. 2775—A bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes

Summary: H.R. 2775 would make the availability of premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies to eligible individuals and families under the Affordable Care Act (ACA) contingent on a certification to the Congress by the Secretary of Health and Human Serv-

ices (HHS) that a program is in place that verifies, consistent with section 1411 of the ACA, the household income and coverage qualifications of people applying for such credits and cost-sharing subsidies. Section 1411 of the ACA establishes requirements for a program to determine whether someone meets the income and coverage qualifications for such premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies (among other things).

CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimate that enacting H.R. 2775 would not affect direct spending or revenues. A program is currently being put in place to verify income and coverage qualifications for the tax credits and subsidies, and that program appears to CBO and JCT to be in accordance with section 1411. Accordingly, we expect that the Secretary would certify before the beginning of 2014, when premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies would first be paid, that the requirements in H.R. 2775 are satisfied.

Pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply to H.R. 2775 because enacting the bill will not affect direct spending or revenues in CBO and JCT's estimation.

H.R. 2775 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (UMRA).

Estimated Cost to the Federal Government: H.R. 2775 would prohibit premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies from being paid before the Secretary of HHS has certified to Congress that a program is in place that verifies, in accordance with section 1411 of the ACA, the household income and coverage qualifications of people applying for such tax credits and subsidies.

Section 1411 of the ACA describes a program to determine whether someone meets income, coverage, and other qualifications for premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies. The section specifies methods for verifying the information provided by applicants and establishes penalties for the provision of false or fraudulent information. In addition, section 1411 establishes reporting requirements for individuals related to determining if the individual has an affordable offer of insurance coverage from an employer. Further, the section specifically grants flexibility to the Secretary of HHS to modify the methods used for verification of information provided by applicants.

In July, the Administration delayed for one year two reporting requirements for certain large employers and health insurance coverage providers. Further, regulations issued by HHS in July provided state-based insurance exchanges with limited flexibility when verifying applicants' household incomes and offers of employment-based health insurance coverage for the 2014 benefit year.

CBO and JCT do not expect that those administrative actions and regulations, by themselves, would prohibit the Secretary from being able to provide certification under H.R. 2775. In particular, the reporting requirements for employers are not covered by section 1411, and the flexibility regarding verification that is provided in the regulations issued by HHS appears to us to be consistent with section 1411. (The regulations that were issued regarding verification are slightly looser than CBO and JCT had previously expected, so we revised our baseline projections following the announcement of those regulations.¹ However, in our judgment, the regulations are consistent with the flexibility granted the Secretary by section 1411.)

1. Congressional Budget Office, Letter to the Honorable Paul Ryan Re: Analysis of the Administration's Announced Delay of Certain Requirements Under the Affordable

Care Act (July 30, 2013), www.cbo.gov/publication/44465

Thus, CBO and JCT conclude that a program is currently being put in place in accordance with section 1411 regarding the verification of household income and coverage qualifications. CBO and JCT expect that this program will be in place by January 1, 2014, when the premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies would begin to be paid. We therefore expect that the Secretary would certify by that time that the requirements in H.R. 2775 are satisfied, allowing premium tax credits and cost-sharing subsidies to be made available on schedule. As a result, we estimate that H.R. 2775 would have no budgetary effects relative to our current baseline projections.

This conclusion, however, is uncertain. The language of H.R. 2775 is unclear regarding the meaning of the term “program.” That term might be construed to go beyond regulations and guidance to encompass operational competence, such as software and enrollment procedures that have been proven to work as provided for in regulations. Determining whether or not those systems work as provided for in regulations, however, may not be possible until there is some experience or data that can be used to evaluate the systems.

Estimate Prepared by: Federal Costs: Jean Hearne, Sarah Masi, and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation; Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Lisa Ramirez-Branum; Impact on the Private Sector: Alexia Diorio.

Estimate Approved by: Holly Harvey, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR LEGISLATION,
Washington, DC, August 22, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: The Secretary has asked that I respond to your letter concerning eligibility determinations under the Affordable Care Act. The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has been working tirelessly to implement the Affordable Care Act to ensure that on October 1, 2013, millions of Americans will have access to quality, affordable health coverage, including private insurance plans through the Marketplaces. This work includes close collaboration with other federal agencies and the states to ensure a consumer-friendly experience for individuals, families, and small businesses applying for coverage while implementing appropriate verification procedures and safeguards to protect federal taxpayer dollars.

It is important to note that verification of income and employer-sponsored coverage applies only to individuals and families seeking financial assistance in the Marketplaces through the insurance affordability programs, which include Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), premium tax credits, and cost-sharing reductions. Federal regulations at 45 CFR 155.320 provide detailed verification procedures for household income and eligibility for and enrollment in employer-sponsored coverage for individuals and families applying for insurance affordability programs.

The Marketplace will check the income information submitted by every individual applying for insurance affordability programs by comparing it with data from tax filings and Social Security data, and in many cases, with the additional use of current wage information that is available electronically. The multi-step process begins when an individual applies for an insurance affordability

program through the Marketplace and affirms or inputs his or her projected annual household income. The Marketplace then compares the applicant's projected annual household income with information available from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and Social Security Administration (SSA). If the data submitted by the applicant cannot be verified by the Marketplace using IRS and SSA data, then the information is compared with wage information from employers provided by Equifax Workforce Solutions (Equifax), which is under contract with HHS to provide this information. If Equifax data does not substantiate the applicant's inputted income, the Marketplace will request an explanation or additional documentation from the applicant.

When documentation is requested, the regulations, at 45 CFR 155.315 (f)(4)(ii), specify that if the consumer meets all other eligibility requirements, he or she will be provided with time-limited advanced payments of the premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions based on his or her attestation to projected household income, while documentation is gathered and submitted to the Marketplace. If documentation is requested and is not provided within the specified timeframe (90 days, which may be extended based on the applicant's good faith efforts to obtain required documentation), the statute specifies that the Marketplace will base its eligibility determination on data from IRS and SSA. If no data from IRS is available, the Marketplace will discontinue advanced payments of premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions.

For eligibility for 2014 only, we recently indicated that HHS will exercise enforcement discretion such that a Marketplace may choose to request additional documentation from a statistically-significant sample of the group of individuals in only one specific situation: when the Marketplace has IRS data, the applicant attests to projected annual household income that is more than ten percent below IRS and SSA data, Equifax data is unavailable, and the individual does not provide a reasonable explanation for the inconsistency between the attestation and IRS and SSA data. In all other cases in which the data submitted by the individual cannot be verified using IRS and SSA data or Equifax data, and the individual does not provide a reasonable explanation for any discrepancy identified between their attestation and electronic data, the Marketplace must request additional documentation. This includes, for example, all cases in which IRS data is not available for an individual, and the attestation to projected annual household income cannot be verified using Equifax data; and all cases in which there is both IRS data and Equifax data for an individual but the attestation to projected annual household income cannot be verified using that data.

We have clarified that, for the Federally-facilitated Marketplace, CMS intends to set the initial size of the sample at 100 percent, such that everyone who is in the circumstance described above in which sampling may be used is asked to submit satisfactory documentation. Since publication of the final rule, we have ascertained that there are sufficient resources to ask every individual in this circumstance for such documentation with no exceptions. State-based Marketplaces may choose to use other sample sizes, provided that they are statistically significant for 2014. As described in 45 CFR 155.320(c)(3)(vi)(F), if satisfactory documentation is not submitted by the end of the resolution period, the Marketplace will determine eligibility based on the IRS and SSA data.

With respect to verification of employer-sponsored coverage, section 1411(a) of the Af-

fordable Care Act requires the Secretary to establish a program for determining eligibility for enrollment in a qualified health plan (QHP) through the Marketplace, advance payments of premium tax credits, and cost-sharing reductions. Section 1411(b) of the Affordable Care Act requires applicants for insurance affordability programs to provide specific information regarding employer-sponsored coverage, and section 1411(d) of the Affordable Care Act requires the Secretary to verify the accuracy of this information, “in such manner as the Secretary determines appropriate.”

The Marketplace requests and verifies employer-sponsored coverage information as part of the eligibility determination process for advance payments of the premium tax credit and cost-sharing reductions. Regulations at 45 CFR 155.320(d) specify that the Marketplace must verify an applicant's access to employer-sponsored coverage through data available to the Marketplace. The Marketplace will have access to electronic data sources for verifying access to employer-sponsored coverage through the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) federal employment data and data from the Small Business Health Options Program (SHOP) Marketplace operating in its state, where available. If discrepancies are identified using either OPM or SHOP data, the Marketplace will notify the applicant and request additional information. If the applicant does not adequately resolve the discrepancy with additional information, the Marketplace will make a final decision based on information obtained from the electronic data sources. A Marketplace may also use additional available electronic data sources that have been approved by HHS for this purpose, based on evidence that the sources are sufficiently current, accurate, and minimize administrative burden.

An individual who applies for insurance affordability programs and has income in the premium tax credit range will input information related to whether or not he or she has access to employer-sponsored coverage that meets the minimum value standard. This process is assisted by the Employer Coverage Tool, a page that is included in the Marketplace's single, streamlined application that will help applicants gather information about any employer health coverage for which they are eligible. Applicants may ask their employer to help fill out the Employer Coverage Tool, or employers may make this information available in other ways, such as by making it part of the notice specified in section 18B of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Marketplace then compares the applicant-supplied employer coverage information with information from OPM and the SHOP, where the Marketplace has access to SHOP data. When information provided by an applicant is inconsistent with OPM or SHOP data, the Marketplace will provide a period of 90 days for the applicant to provide satisfactory documentation or otherwise resolve the inconsistency. Consistent with general Marketplace verification procedures, eligibility for advance payments of the premium tax credits and cost-sharing reductions is provided during the period, to the extent that the applicant is otherwise eligible and attests that he or she understands that any advance premium tax credit paid is subject to reconciliation by the IRS. If documentation is not provided within the specified timeframe (90 days, which may be extended based on the applicant's good faith efforts to obtain required documentation), or documentation provided is not sufficient to resolve the inconsistency, the Marketplace

will make the determination based on available electronic data.

For eligibility for 2014 only, the Marketplace has the flexibility to identify a statistically-significant sample of the applicant population for which OPM, SHOP, or an approved state-based data source do not have available data, and request information regarding employer-sponsored coverage from their employers. The Federally-facilitated Marketplace will conduct the sample-based review and will collect a robust set of data from the income and employer verification process. This data, and information gathered by State-based Marketplaces that are conducting similar reviews, will be used as the basis for analysis to support the development of targeted verification strategies and future enhancements to the verification process.

It is important to note that advance payments of premium tax credits are provided directly to the health insurance plan, not to the consumer. In addition, individuals seeking to purchase insurance in the Marketplace must attest, under penalty of perjury, that they are not filing false information. The Affordable Care Act also provides for penalties when an individual provides false or fraudulent information. Individuals on whose behalf tax credits are provided must acknowledge, before they receive advance payments of the tax credit, that they understand that the payments are reconciled at the close of the year. They must also file income taxes for the year in which the credit is received. All advance payments of premium tax credits are reconciled with the IRS at the close of the year.

With respect to your questions about the employer responsibility requirements, as noted in previous correspondence, decisions regarding administrative action with respect to sections 6055, 6056 and 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code remain under the purview of the Department of the Treasury.

Although HHS regularly works with and communicates with other federal departments that share responsibility for implementation of the Affordable Care Act, particularly with respect to programs or provisions that are cross-cutting, it is important to note that the Department of the Treasury's decision to provide transition relief with respect to insurer and employer reporting requirements under the Internal Revenue Code has no impact on the process for verifying employer-sponsored coverage. HHS' policy regarding verification of employer sponsored coverage was articulated in a series of regulatory documents beginning in August 2011, culminating in the final rule, published on July 15, 2013. Throughout the development of this policy HHS has been clear that we would verify the availability of employer-sponsored coverage against available electronic data sources.

HHS is committed to the successful enrollment of millions of Americans into qualified health plans through the Marketplace, and to ensuring that individuals receive the financial assistance for which they are eligible. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

JIM R. ESQUEA,
Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We're here today because we're supposed to be dealing with the CR, continuing the funding of the Federal Government. But the Republicans are scrapping among themselves and can't figure out what to do.

Now, right now, medical research in my district and across this country is

grinding to a halt. Grant money is disappearing, laboratories are closing, and potentially world-transforming projects are being set aside. Researchers are being laid off, and students are discouraged from entering the field. There is no end in sight.

Now, the question you have to ask yourself is, why is the sequester not being dealt with?

It's the mechanism that's breaking our economy for the future because innovation, research, and our ability to compete in the global marketplace depends on research, which starts now continuously, not to mention the life-saving cures and treatments we're losing because of these empty labs.

So what are we doing here today?

Thank God for ObamaCare. We've got something to do. We can try and repeal it for the 41st time.

ObamaCare, folks, is not going away. It's about to take off. In Washington, Oregon and California, we can't wait. The rest of the States may be sitting on their hands, but we aren't.

And the fact is, even Senator CRUZ from Texas says "you aren't going to win this one."

Now, maybe these endless, pathetic kind of tantrums that we have out here every 2 weeks wouldn't matter if there weren't so many much more important things that need to be done.

We get it. I mean, we really do understand it. The American people even get it, that the Republicans really, really, really, really, really don't like this law. But can't we move on?

Stop screaming about wanting a budget and pass one. You've had the budget; you put the people forward to go and have a conference committee.

Quit dancing around with the CR. America needs jobs, and you can do something about it. It's not just some force of nature we can't control. Our economy is weak because we're starving it. Let's do something about that, instead of this biweekly announcement that you dislike access to affordable care.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), a key member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, when I look across this country and look at who opposes the President's health care law, ObamaCare, it's not just Republicans. The New York Times today says the AFL-CIO is fed up with the law and ready to get it repealed if they can't fix it. Employers across this country are fed up with it. That's why the President delayed it for a year till after the elections.

Come on, let's get a grip and face reality.

But my dislike of the law aside, that's not what this is about. This is about the Federal Government handing out money without verifying who's getting it. That's ludicrous. It's unbelievable.

We have to verify, when I, as an Army Reservist, sign up for TRICARE Select, because now I'm thrown into the ObamaCare exchanges. If you buy alcohol, you have to show an ID. I mean, this is pretty basic.

We just want to verify who's getting government cash. That's it. And that's why I support the bill. It's common sense. Let's pass it.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, 19 days, in just 19 days, millions of working Americans can apply to receive premium assistance tax credits to help them get health insurance. These are neighbors who were previously denied coverage, or who were excluded because of a preexisting condition, or because a small employer could not afford to provide health insurance.

And today's bill is about one thing, and that is to deny those Americans their lawful opportunity, on October 1, to obtain health care security. This bill is certainly not about fraud because there is already a comprehensive system to prevent overpayment and verify income.

This very afternoon, a family that suffers severe injuries in a traffic accident on I-35, or a San Antonio family that is notified of a dread disease, those families that lack affordable health insurance are suddenly overwhelmed with medical bills, and they deserve an alternative; and that alternative is coming on October 1, if these folks can't stop it.

This bill would pull the affordability rug right out from under our working families, just as they're beginning to learn about its availability.

Yes, this is the 41st time that they've tried to delay and dismantle and deny the rights of American working families. We know it won't be their last vote. In fact, next week they're so intent on blocking American families from getting health insurance coverage, they're willing to shut down the entire Federal Government.

And as if that weren't enough, next month they propose to default on the full faith and credit of the United States of America for the first time in our history for the sole purpose of denying American families that don't have insurance now some health security.

I think it's wrong. They talk about trust. Well, I don't think we should trust these zealots with our health care future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yielding myself 15 seconds, yesterday we learned the Federal Government is paying millions of dollars to prisoners for unemployment benefits, millions of dollars of your money to cons in prison. But don't worry, we'll stop the fraud in ObamaCare.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, like my Republican colleagues, I too am concerned about fraud in any public program, whether it's ObamaCare, food stamps, Medicare. Who could be against verification?

But this is not about verification. Again, the 41st failed attempt to submarine reform in health care.

The question before us today is whether or not the risk of fraud in ObamaCare is so pervasive that we should shut down an essential part of the law.

My friends on the other side would have you believe that the administration's decision to delay income and coverage verifications leaves the health care marketplace vulnerable to rampant fraud. This is not the case.

First, federally operated and partnership exchanges still will verify such information beginning in 2014. Only 16 States and the District of Columbia will wait until 2015 to begin more comprehensive verification.

In those instances, the incentive to provide false information is greatly overshadowed by the benefit of doing so. Lying on the exchange form carries with it a penalty of \$25,000. On top of that, anyone who provides false income information will have to pay back the extra subsidies when filing a tax form for 2014.

Additionally, States will audit a statistically significant number of individuals, meaning that everyone has an equal opportunity to be audited.

Finally, fighting fraud requires an investment of funding and resources.

How dare you get up here and talk about a plan when you, in the regular budget, want to cut every penny from resources, from research, from helping us get to the point where American people will be served.

Look, you can't stand success. Help us improve the system, not continue a system where patients are playing second fiddle.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time in case the gentleman from Washington has additional speakers or would like to close on his side. We are prepared to close.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) to close our arguments.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: this is not about the integrity of the tax system. There are any number of areas where we rely far more on discretion to individual taxpayers, and there's no appetite, actually, to move in those areas.

My Republican friends are not interested in providing adequate resources to the IRS to be able to appropriately enforce the tax law right now, and we have hundreds of billions of dollars of taxes that aren't collected.

But this is part of a mean-spirited and shortsighted effort to sabotage the health care reform effort. Bear in mind what's going on in States around the country.

In Missouri, the Republican legislature has been on a rampage that will even make it illegal for State employees to tell Missourians what they're entitled to under State law. This is a new low in, I think, political malpractice.

The Republicans are willing to flirt with shutting down the American Government in their attempt to prevent Americans from getting health care they're entitled to under the law. This is wrong.

I strongly urge that we reject this mean-spirited approach.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I yield the balance of our time to the gentlelady from Tennessee, I make the case, this is simply choice. Those who want to stop fraud in ObamaCare support this bill. Those who want to turn a blind eye to that fraud oppose it.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, even the White House veto threat actually proves the need for the No Subsidies Without Verification Act.

The White House says that H.R. 2775, which simply requires the administration to verify whether people are eligible for taxpayer-funded ObamaCare subsidies before they're doled out, would create delays is what they say. It would create delays.

But the veto threat then goes on to say that the bill is "unnecessary" because the administration officials claim they already have, "an effective and efficient system for verification and eligibility."

So which is it?

Does the Obama administration have a way, other than the honor system, to verify whether someone is eligible for taxpayer subsidies or will requiring the administration to have one create delays?

□ 1030

If they had a transparent verification system in place, one that actually worked, this bill would create no delays. The administration should actually welcome it, and so should all Members of this body, who should vote for this. That's why we need this bill. We need independent verification that programs are in place before taxpayers' subsidies go out the door.

For all taxpayers, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2775.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies without Verification Act sponsored by my good friend from Tennessee, Representative BLACK. I oppose because the goal of this bill is already being accomplished under provisions of the Affordable Care Act. Passage of this bill would simply bog down what is already being done and could cost

hard-working middle class Americans millions. The security of knowing that they have the affordable health insurance coverage they deserve and need. For all practical purpose, one could say that this is the forty-first time that the House has sought to repeal (to no avail) the Affordable Care Act. It is not going to happen! Let's move on so that millions of low and middle income Americans will be eligible to receive tax credits to help them purchase insurance to the tens of millions of Americans who have previously been denied coverage due to preexisting medical conditions will knowing that they can have coverage, peace of mind and the healthcare they need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 339, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 191, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—235

Aderholt	Cook	Griffin (AR)
Alexander	Cotton	Griffith (VA)
Amash	Cramer	Grimm
Amodel	Crawford	Guthrie
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Hall
Bachus	Culberson	Hanna
Barletta	Daines	Harper
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Barrow (GA)	Denham	Hartzler
Barton	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Benishek	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Bentivolio	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Bilirakis	Duffy	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Black	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Blackburn	Ellmers	Huizenga (MI)
Boustany	Farenthold	Hultgren
Brady (TX)	Fincher	Hunter
Bridenstine	Fitzpatrick	Hurt
Brooks (AL)	Fleischmann	Issa
Brooks (IN)	Fleming	Jenkins
Broun (GA)	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fortenberry	Jones
Burgess	Fox	Jordan
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)
Campbell	Gardner	King (IA)
Cantor	Garrett	King (NY)
Capito	Gerlach	Kingston
Carter	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Cassidy	Gibson	Kline
Chabot	Gingrey (GA)	Labrador
Chaffetz	Gohmert	LaMalfa
Coble	Goodlatte	Lamborn
Coffman	Gosar	Lance
Cole	Gowdy	Lankford
Collins (GA)	Granger	Latham
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	Latta
Conaway	Graves (MO)	Lipinski

LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson

Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster

Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—191

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr

Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas

Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz

Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

□ 1101

Messrs. BERA of California and VELA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WALBERG changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 253, noes 147, answered “present” 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—253

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)

Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cole
Collins (NY)
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Brooks (IN)
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes

Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Grayson
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurt
Issa
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Jones

Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica

Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz

NOES—147

Amash
Andrews
Barber
Barr
Bass
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Chu
Clarke
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Cotton
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
DeSantis
Dingell
Eshoo
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Foxy
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al

Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Hall
Heck (NV)
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Latham
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lowey
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Noem
Nugent

Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Sewell (AL)
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Walberg
Walden

Waters Wittman Yoder
Weber (TX) Woodall Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—31

Brady (TX)	Grijalva	Quigley
Calvert	Hanna	Rohrabacher
Castor (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Rush
Coble	Holding	Simpson
Courtney	Labrador	Sires
Crawford	Lynch	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	McCarthy (NY)	Van Hollen
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Visclosky
Duffy	Moran	Webster (FL)
Garcia	Nadler	
Gohmert	Nolan	

□ 1111

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 2013, I was absent from the House and missed rollcall votes 458 and 459.

Had I been present for rollcall vote 458, on passage of H.R. 2775, to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes, I would have voted "No."

Had I been present for rollcall vote 459, on approving the Journal, I would have voted "no."

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR
OF H.R. 1001

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1001, a bill originally introduced by Representative Bonner of Alabama, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprinting pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

□ 1115

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet in pro forma session at 2 p.m., and no votes are expected. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and

Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Madam Speaker, Members are advised that, pending ongoing discussions on the continuing resolution, the House may need to be in session during the week of September 23 and possibly into the weekend. Members should expect an announcement next week regarding when the House would meet during the week of September 23. This is a change from the previously announced schedule.

Madam Speaker, next week, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will likely consider H.R. 1526, the Restoring Healthy Forests for Healthy Communities Act, sponsored by the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Representative DOC HASTINGS. In addition to improving forest health and helping to prevent catastrophic wildfires, this legislation contains a short-term extension of the Secure Rural Schools program.

In addition, I expect the House to consider H.R. 761, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2013, authored by Representative MARK AMODEI; and H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013, drafted by Representative PAUL GOSAR. These bills, both from the Natural Resources Committee, will foster economic growth and create jobs for the middle class.

The House will also consider the Nutrition Reform and Work Opportunity Act, authored by Agriculture chairman, Representative FRANK LUCAS. This legislation restores the intent of the bipartisan welfare reforms adopted in 1996 to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It also refocuses the program on those who need it most. No law-abiding beneficiary who meets the income and asset tests of the current program and is willing to comply with the applicable work requirements will lose his benefits under the bill.

Finally, Madam Speaker, Members should be prepared to vote on the continuing resolution as the new fiscal year approaches.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I would reiterate to Members, in case they weren't listening, that the majority leader has said that we ought to be clearing our calendars for the week of the 23rd of September. That's the last week of the month. Originally, we were scheduled to be off that week, but in light of the fact that we have been unable yet to pass a continuing resolution or appropriations bills to fund the government's activities after the end of the fiscal year on September 30, I am pleased to see the majority leader is putting the House on notice. I have

been telling my Members for the last 2 months to reserve that time in the contingency of which the majority leader speaks.

Mr. Majority Leader, before we left in July, we had a bill on the floor to fund Transportation and the Housing and Urban Development Department as well as other items. That bill was pulled. Subsequent to that bill's being pulled, HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, sent a notice out to a lot of people. I presume the gentleman had an opportunity to read it.

It read:

I am extremely disappointed with the decision to pull the T-HUD bill—as it's referred to—from the House calendar today. The prospects for passing this bill in September are bleak at best given the vote count on passage that was apparent this afternoon.

He then made this statement, Mr. Leader:

With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted 3 months ago. Thus, I—HAL ROGERS speaking—believe that the House has made its choice. Sequestration and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts must be brought to an end.

Mr. Leader, as you know, he went on to say this:

The House, Senate and White House must come together as soon as possible on a comprehensive compromise that repeals sequestration, takes the Nation off this lurching path from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis, reduces our deficits and debt, and provides a realistic, top-line, discretionary spending level to fund the government in a responsible and attainable way.

That was his statement—the chairman from Kentucky, a conservative Republican—on July 31, 2013.

I want to tell my friend, the majority leader, that I agree with Mr. ROGERS. The sequester level is unattainable and unrealistic. That's the chairman of your Appropriations Committee, who is responsible—and has been for many years—for judging what are the appropriate expenditures for our government to maintain programs important to our country, to our economy, and to our national security.

Mr. Leader, we have another issue beyond the continuing resolution which will also, as the gentleman knows, have a very substantial effect on the fiscal credibility of America, on the fiscal stability of America and on the growth of our economy, and of the confidence of our people and of people around the world, and that is the extension of our debt limit. This is going to be a shorter colloquy than we usually have because the issues that confront us are so very, very important.

I want to tell the majority leader that we have not had any discussions about a possible compromise; nor have we had any discussions with Mr. MCCARTHY about a possible compromise; nor have I or the leader had any substantive conversations with the Speaker about a substantive compromise, in our view, consistent with what your chairman of the Appropriations Committee rightfully, in my

view, observed of the fiscal realities confronting our country. You have said and Mr. BOEHNER has said—I believe and Ms. PELOSI believes—that not extending the debt limit is unthinkable; and if we fail to do so, it would have very, very serious, adverse consequences on our country.

So rather than discuss other further scheduling issues, except to the extent that the gentleman wants to respond, let me say to the gentleman that, with these two items in particular, I stand ready to work with your side, and my side stands ready to work with your side on a compromise; but I will tell the gentleman, with all sincerity, that we will not pursue what Mr. ROGERS correctly observed is an unsustainable and damaging process. To that extent, we will not compromise on that issue because your chairman is correct—it's harmful to our country.

So, in that context, Mr. Leader, I am hopeful that, as we move forward, as you've just been required to have another week added to the calendar because we've been unable so far to do our work—and this week, of course, is 1 of 2 weeks that we were supposed to meet in September, and we haven't done much. That's unfortunate. So we have used 50 percent of the time that we had for not much. I would ask the gentleman if he thinks that there is a possibility to compromise. I have observed and the world has observed the difficulty the gentleman and Mr. BOEHNER, the Speaker, have had in getting agreement in your own party, but we need to get agreement between the two parties and the Senate and the President of the United States so that this country can be funded and can meet its obligations and stabilize our economy. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker.

First, I would say I'm glad he received the news that we may very well be in session in the last week of September the way he has because I do think it reflects the seriousness with which both sides take the pending fiscal issues and deadlines that we are about to confront both in the continuing resolution as well as in the debt ceiling, itself.

Now, Madam Speaker, I've set aside the statement that my friend, the Democratic whip, has indicated about not doing anything this week, because we just voted on a bipartisan bill enforcing accountability on ObamaCare.

As the Democratic whip knows, ObamaCare is growingly unpopular in this country. In fact, in the latest public poll out today, nearly 60 percent of Americans reject ObamaCare and the direction in health care, and we are serious and committed on this side of the aisle for a better future for health care. The President, himself, has said that it's not ready for prime time and has issued waivers for businesses, for insurance companies. We need to have a waiver and a delay for all people of ObamaCare.

The bill that we passed today says that the administration is hoping that all of the income subsidies that are still in effect will go forward in a transparent and accountable way. That's really impossible to guard against fraud given that the administration has already exempted corporate America and the businesses from having to comply with the verification of someone's eligibility for subsidies. So there is no way that this law can work; and our side is committed to discussing how we go forward, which is, first and foremost, a delay of ObamaCare.

I'd say to the gentleman that I'm glad that he is willing to sit down and talk, and I would hope that he could impose that upon the administration, because as late as August 27, 2013, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew said:

The President has made it clear: we are not going to negotiate over the debt limit.

I would say, Madam Speaker, history has shown us that in periods of divided government there have always been discussions around the fiscal issues of this country; and in fact, the issue of the debt ceiling has provided a forum for resolution on some of those fiscal issues. Going back to Gramm-Rudman-Hollings that was negotiated and settled around a debt ceiling discussion, as was the Congressional Review Act, as was, Madam Speaker, as we know 2 years ago, the Budget Control Act. So I hope that the gentleman could take his dedication to trying to work things out to the White House and say it's time for all of us to sit down and resolve these issues.

Now, as far as the sequester is concerned, I would say to the gentleman he knows I don't think that the sequester is the right way and the best way to go about reducing spending. I mean, just by its very nature, a blunt, across-the-board cut treats programs that you might want to get rid of in the same way that it treats programs that, perhaps, are really doing a great job. That indiscriminate type of cut is something on which we could really do better. We could do a lot better than doing those kinds of cuts, which is exactly our point. We need to sit down and discuss with this administration how we are going to effect the reforms that we need on the entitlement side and effect the delay of ObamaCare. That's what we've got to do, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. The problem has again been expressed. We have a single focus of the majority party, Madam Speaker, on defunding the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1130

So many Republicans have said it is an unreasonable and irrational expectation to expect, after an election has occurred in which that was one of the principal issues in the election, for the President or, frankly, the Senate, to agree to the objectives of the Republican Party that lost in America on this issue. There was a poll taken November 2012. The President of the United States won that poll. Your my-

opic focus on that one issue threatens to shut down government and put at risk the creditworthiness of the United States of America. That is not what the American people expect.

Unless the gentleman wants to respond, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 3, 2013, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

IN RECOGNITION OF LANGHAM LOGISTICS

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly exceptional Hoosier company and a great friend in Langham Logistics and its president, Cathy Langham.

Today, Langham Logistics will be celebrating their 25th anniversary. Langham Logistics was founded by two sisters, Cathy and Margaret Langham, who took the risk of starting a transportation business. Cathy and Margaret literally built Langham from the ground up, starting in a small office space and now operating a 300,000-square-foot state-of-the-art warehouse that operates and advises supply chains from the smallest of companies to multibillion-dollar corporations throughout the world. Their story is not unlike so many people in this country who dared to dream and then succeeded beyond even their own wildest dreams.

Their customers aren't the only ones who have noticed their hard work. In 2003, then-President George W. Bush visited Langham Logistics to highlight them as a model start-up business that succeeded and was continuing to expand at an amazing rate. It was at that event that I first met Cathy Langham.

Not only has Cathy and her family built this amazing operation, but they did it the right way—through hard work. They gave back and continue to give back every chance they can. I could list all the numerous charities and causes that Cathy, her team, and her family contribute to, but that will go well beyond the 1 minute, Madam Speaker, that I asked for.

On behalf of Hoosiers, I say congratulations to Cathy and Langham Logistics. May you have another 25 years like the last 25.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a truly exceptional Hoosier company and a great friend in Langham Logistics and its President, Cathy Langham.

Today, Langham Logistics will be celebrating their 25th anniversary. Langham Logistics was founded by two sisters, Cathy and Margaret Langham who took the risk of starting a transportation company. Cathy and Margaret literally built Langham from the ground up—starting in a small office space and now operating a 300,000 square foot state-of-the-art warehouse that operates and advises supply chains from the smallest of companies to multibillion dollar corporations throughout the world. Their story is not unlike so many people in this country who dared to dream and then succeeded beyond, even their own, wildest dreams.

Their customers are not the only ones who have noticed their hard work and success. In 2003, then President George W. Bush visited Langham Logistics to highlight them as a model startup business that succeeded and was continuing to expand at an amazing rate. It was at that event that I first met Cathy Langham.

Not only has Cathy and her family built this amazing operation, but they did it the right way. They gave back and continue to give back every chance they can along the way. I could list all of the numerous charities and causes that Cathy, her team, and her family support, but it is not in Cathy's nature to promote her good work.

But one story, that I find remarkable and worth noting here today is that of Cathy's role in the Indianapolis 2012 Super Bowl Host Committee.

While most of us would jump at the chance to highlight Indiana and plan the Super Bowl, Cathy did something quite different with the opportunity. She, along with her friends, launched Indy's Super Cure to benefit the Komen for the Cure Tissue Bank at the Indiana University Simon Cancer Center and to help women who are facing breast cancer.

While many of us would have been distracted, focusing on the Super Bowl, Cathy and her friends made sure to use the event to give back to the community. And Mr. Speaker, honestly, I cannot think of any better example to describe who Cathy is to a stranger, to my colleagues, or to the friends that will gather later today to celebrate this occasion.

On behalf of 4th District Hoosiers, I say congratulations to Cathy and Langham Logistics. May you have another 25 years like the last 25.

NATIONAL SUICIDE PREVENTION WEEK

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, this week is National Suicide Prevention Week.

More than 38,000 Americans die by suicide every year, 90 percent of whom have at least one treatable mental illness.

Veterans account for 20 percent of suicides in this country, and military suicide is at an all-time high. The July 2012 cover of Time Magazine described the tragedy of military suicide with a

simple headline: One a Day. One year later, these rates have remained largely unchanged, and we owe far better to those who have worn or do wear the uniform.

Earlier this summer, I added an amendment to Defense appropriations to add \$10 million for military suicide awareness and prevention. It is our responsibility to care for our troops and for our veterans, and more work needs to be done.

During National Suicide Prevention Week, let us commit to ensuring that every American has access to treatment.

LNG EXPORT CAUCUS

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, America has a lot of clean-burning natural gas.

The Eagle Ford Shale, in the district I represent, has created 400,000 jobs and roughly \$2.6 billion in salaries and benefits in the 13-county area. Similar booms are happening in other parts of the country like North Dakota and Pennsylvania.

Our domestic energy creates widespread economic prosperity and will continue if we don't ruin it with over-regulation and red tape.

Exporting some of America's huge supply of natural gas will create tens of thousands more jobs, narrow our trade deficit by billions, and help both our allies in need like Japan and the environment. When you factor in transportation costs, gas here at home will always be cheaper.

The DOE recently conditionally approved additional LNG export licenses, but there's still a lot of red tape to wade through before these properties open. I worry these contingent licenses artificially overstate the potential for future LNG exports, and the lengths of time these approvals take risks our competitive and economic advantage over Middle Eastern countries.

I, along with three of my colleagues, JIM COSTA, JOE BARTON, and FILEMON VELA, created the LNG Export Caucus to help the development and timely export of LNG and encourage a rational regulatory environment that ensures the production and export of LNG, creating jobs, helping the economy, and cleaning the environment.

PARTNERING FOR ILLINOIS' ECONOMIC FUTURE

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the most pressing issues facing my region of Illinois, and that's creating good-paying jobs and growing the economy. That's why, last month, I launched Partnering for Illinois' Economic Future. The goal of

this initiative is to bring together regional leaders from across economic sectors—from business, educational institutions, and community organizations.

We gathered to discuss ways to increase collaboration, to create jobs and bolster the region's economy and manufacturing sectors. We held regional meetings in Rockford, Peoria, and the Quad Cities in conjunction with the University of Illinois. We will also be holding a District-wide economic summit later this fall.

Before we do this, I want to hear directly from the hardworking people of my region to get their thoughts on how best to create economic opportunity for all. The insight and input from my constituents, combined with the information we collected from the regional meetings, will help us develop solutions that will benefit all of our communities.

THE SYRIAN CIVIL WAR AND U.S. INVOLVEMENT

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the United States is considering sending missiles into Syria. Also, CIA-funded weapons have begun flowing to Syrian rebels.

The rebels are made up of the Free Syrian Army, al Qaeda, and others. It seems the Free Syrian Army is liberating areas, and al Qaeda comes in behind and imposes strict Islamic shari'a law in those territories. Al Qaeda is a terrorist group that is at war with the United States.

Richard Engel, with NBC, interviewed Abu Abdul Rahman, one of the thousands of al Qaeda fighters in Syria. In the interview, Engel asked Rahman this question:

The United States is considering launching military strikes against Syria. Would that help you?

Rahman replied:

We have a prayer: "Allah, please annihilate our enemies by other enemies." Assad is an enemy and America is an enemy. Let them fight.

Madam Speaker, in this civil war, why would we ever consider getting involved by launching missiles into Syria or arming the rebels, which include our enemy, al Qaeda?

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF MS. ALENE WASHINGTON

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Alene Washington from my hometown of Fort Worth, Texas. She is a recent recipient of the President's Award for Service for her dedication and service to Tarrant County senior adults.

Ms. Washington has devoted her life to caring for her community, especially the elderly. She began her tenure at Senior Citizens Services in 1973, and shortly thereafter became the director of Fellowship Corner Senior Center on the south side of Fort Worth on New York Avenue. Here, she has provided care for families through multiple generations, ensuring that they are able to age in place with health and dignity through the activities and friendships offered at Fellowship Corner Senior Center. Here, she empowers older adults to find new friends, improve their health with nutrition and exercise, and contribute back through volunteer service.

Most notably, Ms. Washington founded a dance group known as the Steppin' Grannies, which performs around the DFW Metroplex, giving seniors the opportunity to have fun while staying active.

For over 40 years, Ms. Washington has encouraged older adults throughout Tarrant County to live with purpose and independence. Next week, she will be given the award at the Annual Senior Spirits Awards, given by Senior Citizen Services of Tarrant County.

Madam Speaker, again, I would like to congratulate Ms. Alene Washington and commend her for her dedication to Tarrant County seniors.

NO SUBSIDIES WITHOUT VERIFICATION ACT

(Mr. COFFMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, according to *The Wall Street Journal*, without the legislation just passed by this Chamber, fraudulent subsidy payments under the Affordable Care Act could account for \$250 billion over the next decade. For this reason, I'm proud to have voted in support of H.R. 2775, the No Subsidies Without Verification Act.

The White House has come out in strong opposition to this proposal, citing the fact that a program to verify eligibility already exists. I wonder, though, if a plan already exists, why the strong opposition to this proposal? And in the broader context, why the strong opposition to any proposal that seeks to create accountability with respect to Federal spending?

Across the Nation, millions of families sit at their kitchen tables in order to figure out their limited finances and to make difficult decisions, ensuring that their hard-earned dollars are being stretched to maximum effect. The Federal Government, however, shies away from any opportunity to ensure the same accountability.

Madam Speaker, Americans are tired of seeing their hard-earned tax dollars wasted through fraud. I hope to see this commonsense legislation signed into law.

IN PRAISE OF DR. THOMAS F. FREEMAN: EDUCATOR, SCHOLAR, AND LEGENDARY COACH AND TEACHER OF THE ART OF DEBATE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, this is a great opportunity to rise today to salute and praise Dr. Thomas F. Freeman: educator, scholar, and legendary coach and teacher of the art of debate at the historic Texas Southern University, supporting the historic Texas Southern University debate team.

For those of you who have not heard of that team, I ask you to look closely at the number of awards it has received because of this great educator. He comes from a great family with a great wife, who is also an educator.

Today I rise to salute him as a first-rank scholar, but also as a person of great eloquence, talent, and oration, someone who was inspirational to the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the honorable late Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, my predecessor.

A prodigy himself, Dr. Freeman graduated from Virginia Union University at 18 and went on to become a professor at Virginia Union before his 30th birthday. He would later receive degrees from Andover Newton Theological School, Harvard University, Chicago Divinity School, the University of Vienna in Austria, and the University of Liberia in Africa. Dr. Freeman was among a group of accomplished academics of color hired by Texas Southern University.

What I want to say most about Dr. Freeman is that he is a renaissance man. He's a man of courage. He's a man who broke color lines, teaching at Rice University for 23 years. He is a man that has a number of sayings that are so vital. One is:

There is an ethical dimension to leadership. If you do not consider ethics, then your leadership is hollow.

I thank Dr. Freeman for being the kind of icon that America can honor. His leadership will be rewarded by the many students who have gone on to greatness because of his tutoring. In fact, even Denzel Washington was tutored by Dr. Thomas Freeman.

He is 95 years old and will be honored in his retirement at Texas Southern University tomorrow, Friday, September 13, 2013. However, his light will continue to shine, for he will continue to work with students and to provide light to those who are willing to learn.

Thank you, Dr. Freeman, for being a great American and a great leader and a man of ethics, passion, Christianity, and courage.

□ 1145

INVESTIGATING BENGHAZI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and to do so the day after the anniversary of the tragic attack on America that took place September 11, 2001, and the tragic attack that took place against Americans in Benghazi September 11, 2012.

Who would have believed, Madam Speaker, that a full year would go by and we would still not have the truth, we would still not be to the bottom of the Benghazi events. We still wouldn't have a timeline, we wouldn't have a chronology, we wouldn't have an autopsy report from Ambassador Stevens and others, we wouldn't have the testimony of those who were wounded and those who survived, and we wouldn't have the full story from the administration. And we wouldn't have yet the confession from the administration that they willfully, I believe, misinformed the American people and the United States Congress.

And so the individual who has taken the lead on this Benghazi series of events and called for a special select committee to investigate is the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and I am very pleased to yield to the leader on the Benghazi incident here in the United States Congress, Mr. WOLF of Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. KING for the time. I am very grateful.

Madam Speaker, yesterday marked the one-year anniversary of the deadly attacks on the U.S. consulate and CIA annex in Benghazi, Libya, which took the lives of four Americans, and seriously wounded several others. One is still out at Walter Reed Hospital after one year.

Despite a year of investigations in five different House committees, most of the key questions about what happened in Benghazi and why no response was authorized by Washington remain unanswered. So far the Congress has failed.

That is why since last November I have been pushing for a House select committee to focus on this investigation, hold public hearings, issue subpoenas to key witnesses and survivors, and produce a final report that answers these important questions. One hundred seventy-four Republicans in the House have now cosponsored H. Res. 36 to establish a select committee—three-quarters of the majority—and six new cosponsors joined this week alone.

The select committee approach has been endorsed by family members of the Benghazi victims, the special operations community, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the editorial page of *The Wall Street Journal*, among many other prominent individuals and organizations.

I was pleased to receive a copy of a letter sent to the Speaker earlier this

week calling for the creation of a select committee and signed by some of the most respected and distinguished national security and military leaders that have served our country.

These leaders include:

Former Attorney General Michael Mukasey, who also served as judge in the trial of the Blind Sheikh, the first trial dealing with an attack against the World Trade Center;

Admiral James "Ace" Lyons, U.S. Navy, Retired, former commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific fleet;

General Frederick J. Kroesen, U.S. Army, Retired, former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army;

Lieutenant General William "Jerry" Boykin, U.S. Army, Retired, former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and commander in Mogadishu during the "Black Hawk down" incident;

Lieutenant General Harry Edward Soyster, U.S. Army, Retired, former Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency;

Ambassador Henry Cooper, former chief negotiator of the defense and space talks and the former Director, Strategic Defense Initiative;

Major General Paul E. Vallely, U.S. Army, Retired, former deputy commander of the U.S. Army Forces, Pacific;

Honorable Tidal McCoy, former Secretary of the Air Force;

Lieutenant Colonel Allen West, U.S. Army, Retired, and former Member of Congress;

Honorable Joseph E. Schmitz, former inspector general of the Department of Defense;

Honorable Michelle Van Cleave, former National Counterintelligence Executive;

Vice Admiral Robert Monroe, U.S. Navy, Retired, former Director of the Defense Nuclear Agency; and

Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy.

It is good to have their support for this important effort, and I would like now to read the text of their letter.

They said:

Dear Mr. Speaker:

As former military, intelligence and national security officials with extensive experience in security policy and practice, we are concerned about the American people's apparently serious loss of confidence in the institutions of their government. One factor contributing to this alienation has been the failure of those institutions to respond appropriately to the murderous jihadist attacks in Benghazi on September 11, 2012. They rightly expect, at an absolute minimum, that Congress will ensure accountability of those responsible.

As you are well aware, our country is nearing the first anniversary of the assaults on the Special Mission Compound and CIA Annex in Benghazi. To date, however, the five House committees that share jurisdiction have held only a small number of mostly less-than-illuminating hearings into the policies that led to, and the events that occurred during and after, the murder of four of our countrymen and the wounding of many more.

We appreciate that the chairmen of these committees produced four months ago a joint "interim report." Yet, its authors acknowledged that they did not have answers to many crucial national security questions. In addition, no timeframe has been publicly announced for going beyond the interim report or holding additional hearings toward that end. This is particularly troubling in light of press accounts that the survivors of the Benghazi attack are being intimidated and risk job action should they come forward with their eyewitness account.

If Congress does not afford them an opportunity to do so without fear of retaliation by issuing subpoenas for their testimony, it will be complicit in precluding their help in seeing justice served—and in denying the American people the full accounting to which they are entitled.

They go on to say:

We believe an ample chance has been afforded for the regular order to operate in investigating Benghazi-gate. It has failed to do so. Now is the time for a select committee to be established with a mandate to draw upon the five committees' existing investigative resources and results to date and to complete—if possible by year's end—the necessary, thorough and comprehensive inquiry. This approach can alleviate concern about undue costs and further delay in convening a select committee.

Mr. Speaker, they go on to say:

The survivors want to tell their stories and correct the record. Two different books based on their stories are reportedly in the works. If the American people learn what happened from a published account rather than from those charged with congressional oversight, the perception of a coverup—or at least a serious dereliction of duty—is inevitable.

Our Republic is predicated on the trust of the governed in those they choose to represent them. We must not allow the jihadists who have thus far paid no price for murdering Ambassador Stevens, murdering three of his comrades and afflicting the lives of so many others, to do violence as well to our people's confidence in their constitutional form of government.

For all these reasons, we call upon you to establish without further delay a select committee to investigate the Benghazi attacks.

I think they make a very, very powerful case. For the Congress to fail to do this, as they said, the Congress will be complicit in this. So I call on the Speaker of the House to do what these gentlemen, who have as much experience as any Member who serves in this Congress on either side, have asked us to do, and establish a select committee.

With that, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Virginia and ask if the gentleman could stick around for a moment. I have a couple of questions that occurred to me as I was listening to his presentation. I would like to ask for the record, and your knowledge of the Benghazi incident goes more deep than mine does, and I think probably as deep as anyone in the Congress does, Mr. WOLF, and so I wanted to ask: Do we know how many survivors there were from the Benghazi incident?

Mr. WOLF. There were roughly 30 or 31 or so that waited on the tarmac after the fighting had ended to be

picked up, and they were not picked up in an American plane; they were picked up in a Libyan plane. There were a number of wounded. One, Mr. David Ubben, who is currently out at Walter Reed, and another gentleman who was severely wounded, they were flown out separate from that other group, and they were flown out not in an American plane but in a Libyan plane, maybe even commandeered by those that rescued.

We also know that we lost four. Several were Navy SEALs. And we were also told by those who have been in touch with those on the ground that there was a call from the consulate to the annex saying, help us. They were told to stand down by the CIA station chief, not knowing if that came out of Washington or not. They did stand down. They got another call, and they were told to stand again, and they did stand down. They had another call and they finally said we're not standing down, and they went. Some believe that had they gone at the initial time, they could have saved the life of Ambassador Stevens and Sean Smith.

Mr. KING of Iowa. The information you provided here, especially information as to the numbers of survivors and the numbers of wounded, where they were picked up, and by a Libyan plane, not a U.S. plane, was that information that was forthcomingly delivered to you or the American people by our administration, or how did you learn those facts?

Mr. WOLF. No, it was not delivered by the administration, nor was it delivered by any committee up here. It was delivered by people who are connected to, related to people who were on the ground.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do we know, has any of that information been entered into the record under oath, so far as witnesses are concerned, before the five committees that have jurisdiction?

Mr. WOLF. I think not, but I have not been in some of the closed doors. As you know, that is one of the problems. The Intelligence Committee has everything in closed doors. Quite frankly, if you're a Member of the House, you have very little opportunity to find out sometimes what even goes on in the Intelligence Committee. So they could have been sworn in. The people I have spoken to have not even been called. And I spoke last week, last Tuesday to a person who was on the scene at the time of the attack, and he has not been called.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And so, Mr. WOLF, is it possible that the Select Committee on Intelligence could have had testimony before the committee, and because they are bound by the confidentiality of classified information, that even if they learned something from an open source that also confirms something that they learned in a classified setting, they now are prohibited from speaking about that outside of that room?

Mr. WOLF. I do not know. I do not serve on the Intelligence Committee.

There are all good people on it, and Mr. ROGERS does a good job. I can't answer. They can better answer that. I don't know what the rules are with regard to that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Let me pick up on that. I have a measure of classified rating as a member of the Judiciary Committee. Those are the rules that we are bound by when we go into a classified setting. What we speak about there, what we learn there, even if we know it from an open source before we go in, or even if we learn about it from an open source after we go out, we cannot speak to that topic outside of the room.

That's one of the reasons why we need the select committee. Even if all of the information we need to know happens to be gathered by the special Select Committee on Intelligence, that doesn't get that information that can be declassified declassified, that doesn't get it correlated with the balance of the information that is public knowledge, or the information that has come before the other committees.

Another question: Do we have any autopsy reports from Ambassador Stevens or any of the other three fatalities that were killed in that action a year and a day ago?

Mr. WOLF. My committee that I chair, the House Appropriations subcommittee that funds the Justice Department and the FBI, we have never received an autopsy report. We have been told how the death of the Ambassador took place verbally, but we have never seen the autopsy report.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do we have a timeline that sets down events that took place from its inception to its relative conclusion in the operations and the cleanup that also correlates with a timeline of the situation room in the White House, and who was in the White House and what they knew and when they knew it? Are you aware of any timeline that correlates that?

□ 1200

Mr. WOLF. There may be. Perhaps the Intel Committee has it. I understand there are some timelines out there that do not quite, quite match; but I do not know the answer to that. That's why we need public hearings.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. That's my understanding as well. And this colloquy that we've had here, I think, illuminates the questions, some of the questions that can be answered with a special select committee that would be addressing the Benghazi incident.

And a full year and a day has gone by. The trail gets more cold every day. And just yesterday, I saw the announcement that the administration is going to make some of the survivors available to Congress, finally, after a full year, so that we can have some dialogue with them.

I just envision the 9/11 Commission that sat around the table. They swore in witnesses. They built a public

record. The American people watched in on all of those deliberations so they could draw their judgment on whose version was the most accurate and the closest to the truth.

When the 9/11 Commission report came out, it was a bound book about that thick. I read it. A lot of us read it. But that was the definitive response to the United States Congress that said these are the facts as we can determine them, the reasoned judgment of the United States Congress.

That also happened on the Warren Commission report on the assassination of President Kennedy. I think that the Benghazi incident deserves a full investigation in that fashion.

I applaud the gentleman from Virginia for taking the lead on this, and I'll certainly support it all the way to its conclusion.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman. Thank you for the time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Virginia. And reclaiming my time, I appreciate having the dialog to this extent.

And I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has a real focus on Benghazi. We've had some of this dialogue before, and so I would be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Thank you for yielding, and I want to begin by thanking our colleague from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his leadership with House Resolution 36.

It should not have to come to a select and special committee to investigate this, but it's very apparent that the administration operating on point on this is doing everything they can and expending all resources to obfuscate, stonewall, and keep the truth and the facts from the American people.

And so, while we appreciate the fact that there are numerous committees in the House investigating this simultaneously, but individually, one concerted effort is probably what it's going to take, at the end of the day, to answer the call of this administration who would rather this information not be let out to the American people.

I just want to start out by saying that, you know, a year ago, a year ago on this day, Americans were waking up to or hearing about on their lunch hour that the first Ambassador in over 30 years, a United States Ambassador, had been killed on foreign shores.

And as a person who's operated in the military and as just a citizen who thinks that, look, some of this would make common sense, on the anniversary date of such a historic event and shameful event in America, that we would increase our security posture, especially overseas.

And as a person who has served overseas during 9/11, the anniversary of 9/11, I know very well that we did increase our security posture. So the fact that this happened really leads to questions as to what the heck was going on at the State Department regarding the se-

curity in Benghazi and who was making decisions.

It's disgraceful that an entire year later, despite the fact that a number of terrorists have been identified who have participated in this attack, not one of them has been brought to justice, not one.

And it's also interesting that this administration has the information, the intelligence information that it has regarding Syria. Yet while we were in Benghazi, while we had boots on the ground in Libya, a year later we don't seem to have the facts about the intelligence that occurred there.

Some questions that I have—it's my understanding that Under Secretary Kennedy will be testifying in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee on which I serve next week, and we have some questions for him.

I think the American people want to know why this administration politicized national security during an election cycle regarding the talking points, and who made that order. Who decided that? Who was at the top of that?

The reduction in security forces, again, on 9/11, it's my understanding, with an outpost like Benghazi, that it could only have come from one person. There's only one person in the State Department that is authorized to issue that reduction in security posture, and that is the Secretary.

We want to know whose signature is on the authorization. We want to know who authorized not sending help.

In the military, we don't have a stand down order. But somebody said, no, and somebody didn't contingency plan. Somebody wasn't prepared.

Now, the boots on the ground, the fine soldiers, the airmen, the men and women who would have gone into help, they were ready to go. The United States military was ready to respond. It's the chain of command that wasn't, somewhere along the line. And we want to know who made that decision.

We don't know yet what the Ambassador was doing there. Do we really know?

We've asked the question, but we don't know what his purpose was. Sure, we hear that he was there to solidify that location as an operations point for diplomatic actions and show that everything was normal in Libya again. But on 9/11 you're really going to send him there with a reduced security posture?

Folks, ladies and gentlemen, these Ambassadors don't roll in a car by themselves out to these outposts. They don't even go to their consulates by themselves. They have a security detachment of highly trained people. The vehicles they ride in are not something that you buy on the lot. These guys are loaded up, and they're ready to handle contingencies.

This is abnormal. What was he doing there?

Why does this administration continue to stonewall?

You're hearing that they're giving us everything that we ask for, the emails and so on and so forth.

Why is it that the emails come in a box, to a SCIF, a secure location, our people in the Congress, we're allowed to look at them, our investigators are allowed to look at them, transcribe information, and then the emails go back into the box under armed guard and they're taken away.

We're not allowed to copy them. We're not allowed to get them all at one time. They're meted out to us. Why is that?

If there's nothing to hide, why not have the information so we can all know what it is within the confines of security postures and operational security and security clearances?

Finally, or maybe not finally, who's accountable?

Has anybody been held accountable?

Sure, there were some four employees at the State Department that were excused from their duty for a year, or nearly a year, with pay, and then brought back in. And this is not to disparage those employees.

It's my understanding, since we haven't talked to any of them yet because we've been disallowed to talk to them, that they didn't even know they were held responsible until the day it happened, and they still haven't seen the report that says they were responsible for the reduced security posture. Nobody's been held accountable.

Why wasn't the Secretary involved in the questioning of the ARB, the Accountability Review Board?

The person at the top, not even questioned. That's like having a murder investigation in a family where the husband was having an affair and having strained relations with his wife, the wife was murdered, and he was the only one in town at the time, and not questioning that. That's what that's like.

Nobody questioned the Secretary. Really?

Was there real-time video information via drone, unarmed aerial vehicle?

We heard originally—I was in the questioning, in the hearing with the Secretary, Secretary Clinton, when she originally came earlier this spring, and she said that there was no real-time information.

Yet, on national radio, I heard a guy call into national radio who was the payload operator. And to be clear, the payload operator is not the individual flying the unarmed aerial vehicle. The payload operator is the individual that handles the camera or the weapons system.

So the individual handling the camera called into a national talk show and described what he was seeing as it was occurring. So if we had the real-time information, why weren't we acting on it?

Where is that real-time information?

Why haven't we seen it?

Finally, where was the President during this?

I mean, this is a crisis of national proportion and national security. And I know the President hasn't come before Congress to ask a question, and every

time we ask anybody else the question, the answer's going to be, well, I don't know. I don't keep the President's schedule.

Why can't the American people know the facts?

We just want the truth. We just want the facts. The facts will lead us to the truth. We're not on a witch hunt. The American people deserve to know. The families of the fallen, they deserve to know what happened here.

And I know the administration is hoping that time will go by, debt ceiling, continuing resolution, ObamaCare, Syria, anything will get in the way of finding out what happened here. But we are duty-bound, ladies and gentlemen, Madam Speaker, we are duty-bound to find out this information on behalf of the American people.

I applaud you, Mr. KING. Thank you for yielding the time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and appreciate his presentation here on the floor. I'd ask if he could stick around for a moment because I'm trying to do a little research of my own here, and that is that there's a patchwork of information that's been gathered together.

Among the American people, they'd have collectively, within their memory and their records, all that's publicly available. If we could go out and pull it together and consolidate it, then we could organize it.

This Congress is similar to that. We're representatives of the American people. And from each of our districts, each of our sets of responsibilities and access to information, we can put together some of the puzzle here.

But it's hard to put together a puzzle if you don't have the picture that's on the box. This administration has the box, with the pieces, and the picture on the box of the puzzle of what actually happened in Benghazi, and they knew it almost in real-time. And they have been meting out the information, accepting or admitting to information as it was forced upon them thanks to the media, thanks to people that have done real research.

I recall a statement made to our gathering in our meeting that there weren't any wounded from the Benghazi incident out at Walter Reed Army Hospital. One of our Members went out there and hung around the cafeteria until he found out otherwise and made personal contact and had deep conversations with at least one individual that was a survivor of Benghazi that was in a long-term rehab, Walter Reed. And so that's the level that we have to go to to get an admission.

I wanted to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania just a series of questions that clutter my mind. Have you seen a list of the survivors of Benghazi, those survivors that Mr. WOLF talked about that were picked up on the Tarmac at the airport in Benghazi and flown out by a Libyan plane?

Mr. PERRY. I have not seen the list.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do you know the name of any of those 30-some survivors?

Mr. PERRY. I do not.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And have you seen a timeline that shows what happened in Benghazi from beginning to end, one that is credible, that you have confidence in?

Mr. PERRY. Well, I certainly haven't seen anything that I have confidence in. There's been numerous ones put together, mostly by the side that wants to investigate, that's trying to piece it together based on open-source information.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Open-source timeline. Have you seen any timeline of the Situation Room in the White House?

Mr. PERRY. We have no knowledge of anything in the Situation Room in the White House.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Just wondering. When the assault went on in the compound that took out Osama bin Laden, and I would ask the gentleman, did you see any pictures from inside the Situation Room, and did you see a timeline of the events that took place on that assault?

Mr. PERRY. Sure. The whole world saw that, and rightly so.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Exactly. And as I draw a comparison to Benghazi and the takedown of Osama bin Laden, those circumstances would have been similar, except that we initiated the operation against Osama bin Laden, so I presume there were some people that got invitations to go into the Situation Room and be there. We saw the looks of worry and concern on their faces. I remember the President there in front of it, Secretary Clinton was there, and others in that setting.

But we have no visuals of who was in the Situation Room during Benghazi. We have no timeline of who came into the room, who was in the room, who left the room or when. And in that list would be when the President came, how long he was there, and when he left.

We don't know the answers to that, even though everybody that was in the Situation Room would have known when the President arrived. They would have known when he left. They would have remembered precisely all dialogue that came from the President and almost all that went to the President.

That's how I envision it. Would you envision that the same way, Mr. PERRY?

Mr. PERRY. That's exactly right.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And so the American people need to know this. Do you have any knowledge of who had custody of the body of Ambassador Stevens from the moment he was killed until such time as he turned up at the hospital in Benghazi?

Mr. PERRY. Well, there's been some conflicting reports between, again, open source, between the rebels, and

then he went to the hospital and was picked up by some of the folks from Tripoli; but then he wasn't there, and they—there's nothing congruent in that.

I'm not sure the custody, the chain of custody regarding the Ambassador's body. We're pretty sure we know what happened to it, and it's very unpleasant. But again, without an autopsy we can't even be sure of that.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would agree. And the individuals that delivered Ambassador Stevens' body to the hospital should be available to us. We should have been able to put them under oath and gather the record of what took place there. We don't know who had custody of Ambassador Stevens' body. We just know his body showed up at the hospital.

And the balance of that is conjecture, although we've seen at least one picture of him being carried through the streets in a vertical way, with no knowledge of whether he was alive or dead at that time. Most believe that he was dead at that time, but we just simply don't know.

And can you imagine if it's your family member who had gone through this, and to be locked out from the truth, if you'd lost one of the four lives that we lost in that, or if you're one of those that is wounded and has been muzzled.

□ 1215

The argument came out yesterday that the administration asserts that they have not commanded people to be muzzled or to be quiet about what happened in Benghazi, yet there's the intimidation factor. If your top officers lean on you and say, You've already taken a confidentiality oath, you better stick with that confidentiality oath.

As a former member of the armed services, if you're bound by confidentiality and you've already taken the oath and then your commander, your superior comes to you and says, You've been involved in an incident, and you're bound to that confidentiality, would you honor that, Mr. PERRY?

Mr. PERRY. Well, in the interest of national security, you're in a dilemma. You've taken an oath and you do have a confidentiality requirement. However, I would also say there is a compelling reason for you to provide information to the American people and certainly to the Congress.

I know that the Foreign Affairs Committee has set up hearings with some of these folks and they have said they were coming, and then, miraculously and mysteriously, they declined between the time they said they were coming and the time they were supposed to appear. And so we're not sure why they would agree to it at the onset and then decide to change their mind hence. I think it's a very compelling question. But I think in the interest of finding out the truth, they would be compelled to testify under oath.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do you believe that the attack by our enemies on our

Ambassador and the other victims was a planned attack or a spontaneous eruption?

Mr. PERRY. There's no doubt in America's mind, the world's mind. Libyan intelligence knew it within 24 hours.

And we have the fact that our Ambassador, which—by the way, I must say that it besmirches her credibility, the President's credibility, the administration's credibility, including the recent activities regarding Syrian foreign policy and decisionmaking, to go out for weeks on end, including the President, and issue talking points that they clearly knew were false. They knew they were false, and the world knows they're false now. Most of the world knew they were false then.

This was not a spontaneous eruption of violence, including RPGs and a coordinated attack. Coordinating the attack requires planning. It requires resourcing. That didn't happen in a few moment's time over a video, which maybe that gentleman is still in prison to this day. The only person held accountable for this, I think, is arguably somebody who had absolutely nothing to do with this.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do you believe that the administration knew in real-time that it was a planned attack on our Ambassador and an assassination attempt?

Mr. PERRY. Since the Ambassador himself and his deputy both reported it was a real-time, coordinated attack, not a spontaneous demonstration, I'm very certain in my heart and my mind that the administration knew what was happening.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Do you think Susan Rice knew when she went before the five television networks the following Sunday?

Mr. PERRY. Again, we want to know who changed the talking points. I don't want to indict her if she was given the talking points. But at the level she was operating, she either should have known or corroborated the talking points. And so, to a certain extent, I think she's culpable, and it's reasonable to expect that she did know the talking points were changed and she was misleading the public.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he attended the classified briefing Monday at 5 o'clock.

Mr. PERRY. I did.

Mr. KING of Iowa. What level of confidence did that give you when you see Ambassador Susan Rice there to lead the briefing?

Mr. PERRY. Again, I suggest that the administration has a trust and confidence issue not only with this Congress but with the American people, and that is one of the reasons. You can't send somebody out at the top levels of government to provide information on such a sensitive issue as potentially going to war or an act of war whose credibility has been diminished by her own actions and the actions of

this administration. So I think that that trust and confidence has been eroded because of prior actions, particularly with Benghazi and Libya.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And I would agree wholeheartedly, Mr. PERRY, and end this one remaining component of this topic that I think that you alluded to somewhat in your statement. The question is: What was Ambassador Stevens doing in Benghazi?

We've seen the announcement that came out last night or today that our administration is funneling weapons now into some elements of the Free Syrian Army. I'm concerned that those elements are the Muslim Brotherhood elements of the Free Syrian Army. But they have now announced that they're finally getting some resources in there. If that was the plan and the strategy, to funnel weapons into the Free Syrian Army a year ago, that would have been a better strategy because the Muslim Brotherhood hadn't completely taken over that operation then.

But some have speculated in the media—and we don't know because we haven't had a select committee that brought all this information out—that that was part of the business that may have been taking place in Benghazi. I don't have confirmation that that is the case. And I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if you have seen any evidence that that might be the operation that was taking place and the reason that Ambassador Stevens was in Benghazi that day.

Mr. PERRY. We've seen no evidence. We've been given no evidence. We have asked the questions directly and been denied.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Denied a straight answer to that.

Mr. PERRY. Denied any answers.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Denied any answers.

So what we know is that the administration immediately announced that it was a spontaneous eruption of a protest over a video. How they ever found that information to even be able to tie it to it because it's completely disconnected and illogical, but they sent Susan Rice out before the American public and on five networks she gave the same story. And now she's been awarded with the confidence of the President to advance her even more within this administration and sent before the House of Representatives in a classified setting to lead us in the briefing on potential Syrian engagement.

So we know it wasn't a video. Do we know if the individual who actually produced that video is yet out of jail? Do you have any information?

Mr. PERRY. He may be. I'm not sure. He may be out of jail. But I know he was held accountable at some point, and he literally did go to jail. And I would say it's arguable that he had absolutely anything to do with this or anything else.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And the last information I had was that he was still in

jail. That's been some weeks ago. But I think he's a person you might be able to identify as a political prisoner at this point. It's unlikely that he would be in jail for his not meeting the parole requirements for this period of time except for the politics that he got wrapped up into, Madam Speaker.

All of these things that are inaccuracies and some of them outright dishonesties. There's been no question that this administration went out and willfully misinformed the American people. They did so in open source setting, the President's dialogue directly to the United Nations and multiple oblique references to a video. They knew in real-time that it was a planned attack. There's a reason why we know that, and I know Mr. PERRY knows that reason.

I ask you if you can tell us here why we know that it was a planned attack against our U.S. Ambassador.

Mr. PERRY. Like I said, you don't just bring heavy weapons like RPGs and things of this sort to a spontaneous eruption and demonstration. Like I said, it requires resourcing, ammunition.

This thing went on for hours and hours with heavy weapons. You just don't show up with a belt-fed weapon and the ammunition to support it on a whim. This is something that's heavy to carry. The ammunition is heavy to carry. It requires vehicles and people and coordination and what we call fields of fire, so you don't shoot the friendly; you only shoot the enemy. This coordination takes effort and time. It doesn't happen in a minute or two.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I recall a message that came out from the administration that Libya is a highly armed country and people walk around with AK-47s or else they've got them very handy so, if there's a violent demonstration, that they can grab their AK-47 and run to the sound of not the guns but the demonstration.

I don't disagree that that's a possibility in Libya. I know it was a possibility in Iraq with the armament that they have or the weapons they have in their homes. But we also know that there were RPGs there. We know that there were mortars there.

We know that there were two locations. The first location was where the attack took place, and then there was a fallback location. One was the compound and one was the annex. We know that there were mortar rounds dropped in on the secondary location. It looked like, the sequence, that they had already dialed in that secondary location as a target. If that's the case, not only was it a planned attack, but it was a planned attack with intel that had the secondary location, the alternative location where they would retreat to once attacked, and the primary location already set up, the mortars zeroed in on that.

Does that fit with what you know from a military background, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Absolutely. A mortar is what we call an indirect fire method weapon. You don't necessarily have to see the target. You lob the round into the target. So it requires coordination and known points of where the mortar is located versus where the target is located. You have to shoot the right angle and the right azimuth.

It's not just something that's done capriciously or quickly. There's a thing called a baseplate, which holds this mortar tube. It has to be carried. It usually takes several men or a vehicle, depending on the size of the mortar. And then there's the ammunition that comes in cases. It's not something that you just carry around in your pocket. It's heavy. And you're not just shooting one, so multiple cases.

Again, logistics and support for this, planning for this. Of course, like you said, the planning on multiple locations of attack. They would have to know that. They would have to know the location of where it is, of course, and where their firing point was for the best field of fire and security from opposing fire.

Of course, I think the Ambassador described all this in his phone calls. Our troops on the ground, some of them who perished, lasered the target, expecting support from the United States, from what they knew. You never go without knowing who your support is going to be, what your backup plan is. These folks fully expected some guided munitions to come take out the assault, but it never came.

And so there's no doubt in my mind that this was a coordinated, well-prepared attack, and there's also no doubt in my mind that the administration knew this very early on. Maybe if they didn't know it within 24 hours, they certainly knew it within the span of a week. But the misleading of the American public went on for weeks.

Mr. KING of Iowa. If the gentleman were going to set up a mortar and zero in on a target, what would be the minimum number of rounds that it would take to have confidence that you can zero in on the top of a building?

Mr. PERRY. Well, a mortar is what we call an area weapon, so you're not going to shoot a mortar into a window. But what they fire on, they sometimes shoot long, they shoot over, or they shoot short. So they bracket it. They adjust the tube back and forth until they get it to range. But if you have a known point that you're firing from and a known point that you you're firing to, you can do that with much greater accuracy in much less time.

I would suggest that they had that all figured out when they showed up, which is how they were able to deliver rounds on the target immediately.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I would ask the gentleman, if the third mortar round was the fatal round for two of our brave Americans, would that indicate that that mortar had been set up and planned in advance?

Mr. PERRY. Absolutely. You must know that it takes multiple, what we call, registration rounds and so on and so forth to bracket a target, multiple iterations of firing the tube or the mortar to hit the target. I'm talking half a dozen, a dozen times, and it's very precise.

So they knew exactly what they were doing. They had this planned well in advance, in my opinion.

Mr. KING of Iowa. And we would have known that in almost real-time in the Situation Room in the White House, would be what I would say, and yet still people went out and made the story that it was a movie. And then after the story of the movie began to break down, it became, well, it was actually a spontaneous response and people came running with the weapons that they had.

We've gotten more truth out in this dialogue that we've had here in this past 45 minutes on the floor of the House of Representatives than has willingly been brought forward by this administration.

I have said that Benghazi is worse than Watergate. I think that's a very easy position to hold in that Watergate was a burglary that the President found out about afterwards. It was wrong for President Nixon to seek to cover that burglary up. It cost him the Presidency and it cost America dearly in the events of history that unfolded from that, but this is something that goes deeper and worse.

I believe it was a planned assassination attack on our Ambassador, and I believe that we had a whole group of heroic Americans who conducted themselves very well and they deserve to be identified, if they want to be, and they deserve the respect and appreciation and the honor that the American people would like to give them.

The best thing we can do for the memories of those that are lost is to provide the full truth that goes outside that that must be classified. As history moves on, classification changes because of relevance of need for it to remain secret also changes.

So perhaps today we can pick up the momentum to get those final signatures on the Wolf resolution, get to the point where we can convince our Speaker that we need to have this special select committee to investigate Benghazi, that it incorporates the top people from the five committees that have jurisdiction to do those kind of hearings with a significant budget where we can make sure that it's well staffed and also subpoena the people that we need to put that record out into the public eye and the public ear, record that record and build that and put it into a bound copy, a version which says, This is the reasoned judgment of Congress. These are the facts as they can be gathered, and that has been scrutinized by the public in real-time.

□ 1230

If we do that—we can draw our conclusions; historians will be able to

draw their conclusions—we can do honor to those who lost their lives, gave their lives for us. We can do honor to those who have suffered serious wounds, and we can do honor to those who were in that conflict. And we can clean this up to the point where all of those that serve us in the Foreign Service and put their lives on the line—and there have been, by my recollection, eight Ambassadors who have lost their lives in the line of duty or died while in service of our country over the course of the history of the United States—Ambassador Stevens the most recent, the most violent, but also the one that they have the most questions about.

This was going to be an open administration, one of the most transparent in history. And now we have the Secretary of State who presided over this, who was the lead voice, the one who should have given us the most direct response, has not given us a full testimony. She did appear before a Senate committee and it was a limited amount of testimony, but she has not come clean with this.

As we see this, the situation of the coverup of the facts of Benghazi, we are also seeing the people that are engaged in this that do know the facts asking for an even higher level of responsibility in leadership, in fact, all the way to the White House seems to be the direction that the former Secretary of State would like to take. I'm going to suggest, Madam Speaker, that this can't happen in America. You cannot have someone who covered up something worse than Watergate find a path to go back to the White House and then put this country back under another shield to hide information, a coverup. The American people deserve the truth.

One of the strengths that we have as a Nation is because we have been willing to face the real truth, face the real realities, and brace up and take on the enemies within the world. The people that serve this country, and do so with dignity and honor and nobility, are those in uniform. But it isn't only those in uniform. It's those that are in the CIA. It's some of the civilian contractors that have served in our military that are also part now of civilian security detail. There are those in the State Department that know they're out there on the edge and on the end. We need to honor all of them by bringing the truth out.

There are many people, especially within the State Department and the CIA, who are sick at heart because they know the real truth. We need to give them an opportunity to bring that real truth out.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Well, you are absolutely right, Mr. KING. As you already stated, the American people deserve to know.

Scarcely 6 weeks ago, I talked to some of the families of the fallen who have not, since that fateful day nearly—well, it's a year ago now; then it

was just nearly a year—have still not gotten any answers from the administration. As a matter of fact, the administration doesn't talk to them at all. They're coming into Congress asking us to find answers.

I would ask the American people: Is that how you want the people that serve this country overseas in very dangerous situations to be treated? Some of these are former military members serving in this capacity as security detail for the Ambassador, or that just picked up and went to the fight, even though they were told not to, and gave their lives. Their lives were taken from them. And this is how their families are being treated. They're dead, and their families are getting no resolution. They're getting no closure on this thing. And it's at the hands of this Federal Government and this administration. It's reprehensible. And it can be stopped immediately if they would just answer the questions that we have, that all Americans have.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I will just say a few more words, Madam Speaker.

I sat through a series of briefings over the last week or a little better in different places around the world. In one of those briefings, one of our Special Operations Forces personnel made a point that they were ready to go to Benghazi. Now, there's nobody there that trains that isn't ready. Nobody is reluctant to step in and serve. No matter how dangerous a mission, no matter what the prospects are of success, if there are Americans in trouble and they are given the green light—and that's the order to go into battle—they don't hesitate. They don't shrink back. They don't think, "I wish I wasn't here." They train for that. And as they train for that, there is no hesitation.

So we should always know that our military men and women, our security personnel, there is no hesitation on their part. They wanted to be there. That's why, when they got the order to stand down at the third time, they went anyway because these were brethren that needed to be protected.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PERRY. I would ask, Mr. KING, we were told that there wasn't adequate time, that reinforcements and help were too far away. How did the administration know how long this was going to take, how long this attack was going to go on for? Because when the calls came from the Ambassador, it was hours and hours later until he perished, until others perished. During that period of time, we could have sent people on the way. Maybe they would have never gotten there in time, and maybe that's still a failure in planning, but I think the American people could forgive the mistake with the effort. But the effort wasn't made at all.

And I wonder who made the determination that this is going to end in 2 hours or 3 hours or 10 hours or 10 minutes and said, No, we're not going to send anybody because it's going to be

over. How did they know that? I would suggest they never knew that because they never had any intention of sending anybody because they never had any plan. They never expected this, they never wanted this, and they hoped it would go away quietly into the night. That's what I would suggest.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, reclaiming my time, it appears to me that there was a political decision that was made in the Situation Room in the White House, and that political decision was: We're in a tough, tight, reelection battle. This is September 11. We are less than 2 months before the election date. This could become a whole pivotal issue that the election is decided upon. Let's see if we can slide this thing down and tamp it under the rug and maybe it will go away. Maybe it won't be as big or as bad as we fear that it is. That is the question that comes back.

There is a time in this job to do your duty. There is a time in this political arena that we're in that you set aside politics. There is a time when you look at your reelection and you decide, My job here in this moment doing the right thing is more important than any prospects of how people will vote 2 months from now or a year or more from now. That's that sense of duty.

That's why we take an oath to uphold this Constitution. We all stand here on the floor of this House and take this oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. The President does so. The executive personnel do so.

When I look back through history, I can think of no time that our leadership in the White House has decided that the political calculation was more important than the lives of an Ambassador that had an opportunity to be saved. And maybe we would not have been able to save the Ambassador. Maybe we could have saved two of the others that were killed later in that operation. But we could have at least been there to send that message and to intimidate. And we're now a year and a day later. The press has identified some of the perpetrators. They have gone to Benghazi and sat down and had lunch and interviewed them. There are at least three media networks that have interviewed one or more of these perpetrators. If we know who they are and justice was going to be brought to them, why hasn't that been the case? Why hasn't this administration acted?

Meanwhile, they will tell us they know exactly how to put a precision strike in on Assad in Syria to send just the right message that won't tip the balance of power and change the result of the civil war in Syria, but it will give him the message that he won't use weapons of mass destruction again. They have enough intel to apparently do that, but not enough intel to just follow the reporters around in Benghazi and collar the people that they talk to. That would be just that simple.

Furthermore, the intel that seems to have identified the elements of the

Free Syrian Army, I'll just say a few words about that that I've gathered as I have circumnavigated this globe and sat down in a whole series of meetings that took place that put the pieces of the puzzle together on the intel with Syria and Egypt and others.

Just on the Syria side, we had a Free Syrian Army that emerged. It emerged as a popular uprising against Assad for his cruel and evil dictatorship of his people and for killing some of his own people even then, his political enemies. And the Free Syrian Army emerged. So they should have easily been the people that we supported.

Well, as that battle went on, they were taking over different areas within Syria, tactical objectives and communities and cities and large geographical areas of Syria. And at a certain point, the Muslim Brotherhood stepped in. They took over some parts of the Free Syrian Army. They set up an operation to essentially sacrifice the leader of the Free Syrian Army. He was captured in an operation where he was sacrificed. They took him out of command. His successor commander now has been marginalized and pushed off to the side.

And the Free Syrian Army—the knowledge that I have—is now controlled by the Muslim Brotherhood and other radical Islamist entities, including al Qaeda. That is the entity that we now have good enough intel that we are starting to send supplies and military supplies into.

Those two entities, Assad and radical Islamist components, which is a large component of the Free Syrian Army, they're the bad guys. They're both our enemies. Yet the administration is in the business now, a year after that should have been happening in an aggressive way, of arming some of the wrong people.

It's not that we didn't have good choices. There still are good choices. There still are good people in Syria and outside Syria that will step forward that want to have a secular Syria, a Syria that has freedom of religion, a Syria that is run by the people of Syria. Those elements are still there in Syria and around Syria—at least 2 million Syrian refugees. That force can be put together. It takes longer than firing a cruise missile into Damascus and picking a target to send a pinprick message. It can be done, but I'm not confident that this administration has identified our friends.

What I have seen is that, when we've aligned with anybody in the Middle East, it's been the Muslim Brotherhood. We've had 2½ years of the Arab Spring; and in every break that has changed the power within the countries of North Africa and the Middle East, every break has gone in favor of the Muslim Brotherhood, except one. That is now, when the Muslim Brotherhood took over Egypt under Morsi. Thirty to 33 million people came to the streets in a popular demonstration—the largest demonstration in the history of the

world—to unseat Morsi because they don't have a constitutional way to impeach him. They didn't have a way to arrest him. The only thing they could do was go to the streets and demand that he be removed from power.

Our administration sent a message before Morsi came to power that Mubarak had to be gone yesterday—remember that word? “He needs to be gone yesterday.” Well, that upset the balance of power in Egypt. That helped Morsi come to power. Morsi squeaked by by winning an election with 5.8 million people voting for him out of 83 million or so Egyptians altogether. Not exactly what you would call a majority of the people supporting Morsi—Morsi's complete incompetence, but also his very bold moves to consolidate power within Egypt to where it became clear that there was not going to be another election in Egypt and that the Muslim Brotherhood was going to impose shari'a law. And you start seeing that happen.

Well, 30 to 33 million people in the streets of Egypt, and the Egyptian military stepped forward to support the popular uprising that took place. Now they have laid out a time line, a roadmap to write a constitution, put a constitution out on a public vote to ratify and then to elect a president and a civilian government. And General Assisi has pledged to turn over this military control of the Egyptian Government to a newly elected, legitimate civilian government. That time line is a good time line. It's a good commitment that has been set up and it's a good result.

The problem we have is that our administration was against Mubarak and helped push him out of power. That helped open the door for Morsi, who came in—one of the Muslim Brotherhood. And it's clear, this new leadership, the interim President of Egypt, General Assisi, commanding the military—and also, by the way, they have the support of the Pope of the Coptic Christian Church in Egypt—all of that, the new forces are clear. They oppose the Muslim Brotherhood.

The struggle within the Middle East, Muslim Brotherhood, radical Islam, radical and violent Islamist groups working against the free people in that part of the world, we need to be on the right side of everyone, not on the wrong side of everyone. And the administration is going to have to turn their course around in Egypt and get behind the new administration and support new elections and a new constitution.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to pose a question to you based on what you've seen regarding Syria and Benghazi and Libya, the classified briefings and your travels.

This administration reported to us that Syria had used chemical weapons 11 times previously. On the 12th time, we want to send a message that that's not okay—and it's not okay, let's be

clear about that. But why didn't we send a message and why haven't we sent a message that it's not okay to kill a United States Ambassador? When is that message going to be sent?

I would just like to get your thoughts on that and the dichotomy and the lack of parallel in some kind of strategy and foreign policy that is congruent and makes sense to our allies and our adversaries.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, I would just say to the gentleman that he has pointed out a stark contradiction in our policy. Eleven or 12 times of alleged, at least, weapons of mass destruction used against the Syrian people. I'm going to suggest that this push now is because some of the people that want those elements of the Free Syrian Army that I described to succeed are saying, Help us out by landing a strike or two in on Assad. That's my guess.

But with regard to justice for the people that perpetrated the Benghazi incident against our Americans and our American Ambassador, that justice needs to be delivered. We know who some of those people are. And it's irresponsible of this administration to shut information down to the United States Congress, to the American people, and to fail to act when they have a clear act of war committed against the United States on U.S. territory.

□12:45

I'm aware that the clock has ticked down here to the end.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for coming to the floor. I'm sure that he wasn't aware that this wasn't choreographed. It was a spontaneous eruption of protest calling for the truth to come out and a light to shine on Benghazi.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his leadership on this, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALMON). The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PRINCIPLES FOR MODERNIZING THE MILITARY COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT SYSTEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-60)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 674(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2013, Public Law 112-239, January 2, 2013, I hereby transmit principles for modernizing the military compensation and retirement systems requested by the Act.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 12, 2013.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, as the House adjourns, I want to note that when we come back the House will be in session for 5 days before the end of the fiscal year. That could bring a shutdown of the Federal Government. What most Americans don't know is that that could bring a shutdown also of the government of the Nation's Capital, the District of Columbia.

I want to make clear that there is not a single Member of this House or the Senate who desires that outcome. There is nothing in that for anybody. Many Members of Congress and their staff actually live in the District of Columbia, so to have the Nation's Capital shut down is not anything that would be even in their interest.

Beyond their own interest, most Members of Congress believe in local control and are mystified when they come here, whatever their party, to find that the Congress has anything to do with the local budget of the District of Columbia—\$8 billion raised by the city—which has to come here before the city can spend a dime of its own money.

The city has before the Congress, as I speak, a balanced budget. In fact, a budget that has won plaudits all around the country, and even in this Congress, because of the fund balance that the city has managed to build—over \$1 billion—over time. D.C.'s very middle name should be "prudence." If anything, the District of Columbia has been an example of what we are trying to get cities and States all across the country to do.

I understand why the leadership decided not to move forward with a continuing resolution, which would have guaranteed that the government would remain open until December 15. They need the time to get the votes and to satisfy their Members. That's perfectly understandable. What would not be understandable is if we went through another shutdown crisis.

The government actually did shut down about 18 years ago. I do want to say here on the floor how grateful I am to the Speaker of the House at the time, Newt Gingrich, who indeed kept the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, open during multiple shutdowns of the Federal Government. He did so simply because it makes no sense to shut down the government of the Nation's Capital, which has not one ounce of interest in or blame for the

disputes that have increasingly grown and have caused us to go on continuing resolutions because we do not get our bills done in time. There needs to be time to reconcile those matters.

It is important to note that the District of Columbia budget, which was submitted here on time, is in such good shape that it did, in fact, pass both of the appropriation committees that receive it. So there's no issue here involving the District of Columbia, no reason why anybody would want it entangled in a Federal dispute. In fact, I thought that my good friends in the majority, above all, stood for disentanglement of the Federal Government from what should rightly be the work of the localities.

I hasten to say this is an unintended consequence that comes from the fact that most Members don't even know it. Members come here to do the business of their district and the Federal Government. They don't come here to be educated on the District of Columbia. They have no idea that the District would close down if there was a close-down of the Federal Government. They would understand that I must do my job, and that is to take whatever steps I can to make sure that this unintended result does not occur.

I'm asking to testify at the Rules Committee when the continuing resolution is considered. That is the resolution, as I indicated, that would keep the government open until December 15. It is interesting to know that with only a slight change the District of Columbia would not be an issue here.

I want to thank the Republican appropriators who—it must be at least 10 years ago—corrected another consequence that the Congress never intended. The District budget used to be held up whenever the budget, of course, of the Federal Government was held up, and for the very same reason that it hadn't come to the floor.

So you had a city whose budget was due out by September 30 which sometimes got out in November or December. This wreaked havoc on the opening of schools and on the ability of the city to contract because the budget was over here and hadn't been passed.

It is important also to put on the record that the budget doesn't come here because any Member of the Congress is interested in the budget or thinks that their oversight is necessary to make sure that the budget is done correctly. In fact, the budget is virtually never looked at.

What does happen when a budget comes here is that extraneous amendments that reflect the views, not of the District of Columbia, but of a Member who is offering them, often are attached to our budget.

The Appropriations Committee has never interfered with the budget itself. How could they? The budget has been put together by D.C. Council subcommittees and committees and the city has a chief financial officer—the only jurisdiction in the United States

that has a financial officer appointed for 5 years, cannot be fired except for cause, who has to pass on the budget and make sure that there is no overspending. The D.C. budget comes here out of tradition. It comes here because for more than 200 years it has come here while the Congress has been trying to figure out how to deal with the anomalous position that it has put its Nation's Capital in.

So here it is. In order to avoid the budget getting out so late that you cripple or certainly make extremely difficult the ability of the city officials to run a big, complicated city, the appropriators agreed upon a small change. I'm asking us to act on that already existing change.

That change says that in every CR there will be, no matter what the CR says, and most CRs say very little, that the District will be allowed to spend its own funds at the levels that have been approved by its council, and by the Mayor, at next year's level. That has had enormously important good effects on the city. I believe we will be in the upcoming CR in the same way.

As the District's Member of Congress, I have to contemplate the possibility, however, that even on December 15 the government could close down. And I would have to, indeed, look at what would be even, perhaps, better, that it didn't close down but there was yet another CR. Imagine trying to run a big city in the United States on multiple CRs. That's what I'm trying to avoid. That's what no Member of Congress intends.

I also have had to take precautions for the possibility that even the CR that comes before us—I'm hoping next week—could fail. If that CR fails, I also have a bill that would allow the District to run whenever the Federal Government shuts down, this year and in perpetuity. Again, if I am right that there is no Member who would like to shut down any local jurisdiction, and especially the Nation's Capital, then I think this bill would take care of it.

I have to go now to the Rules Committee for the CR, the next step. That's the next opportunity to draw this matter to the attention of the House and to, therefore, by amendment allow the District to spend for the entire fiscal year, not from CR to CR, but for the entire fiscal year.

I don't think that is asking too much, and I've never had an objection when I've tried to keep the District open. It has been difficult to do. Three times the District almost shut down in recent history because we got that close to it.

The problem for the city when the city almost closes down runs close to being like if it does close down. The city can't assume the best; it has to assume the worst, so it has to call out its staff and its lead officials to prepare for a shutdown even if a shutdown does not occur.

The only responsible thing for the city to do right now with only 5 session

days left, at least as it now stands, because there is to be a recess beginning at the end of the month, is we've got to assume the status quo and we've got to assume the worst because it would be irresponsible not to. So, in addition, I have to put in a bill—that's in addition to the amendment—that would allow the District to remain open.

To illustrate just how unintended would be a shutdown, the House needs to know that the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, on which I sit, has passed a bill that would give the District more autonomy over its local budget and, importantly, would keep the District from shutting down. That bill now is pending and could come to the floor at any point.

□ 1300

The President of the United States has in his budget a shutdown avoidance bill for the District, and the Senate Appropriations Committee has the same language in its bill. The House appropriators have taken the position that they do not believe the District should be shut down. Of course, they defer to the authorizers, as I indicated, and the Oversight Committee has legislation that has been voted out of committee that is now pending.

I think any Member who has held local office—and by the way, I did not hold local office before I came to Congress—have, I think, a better idea of what such a threat means to a local jurisdiction and how much it is at odds with what both sides understand to be the American approach to federalism, when local jurisdictions get to run their own localities and States and, by the way, get to raise their own funds. That is what the District has done, and it has done it well.

These frequent shutdown threats have had a very disruptive effect on the city and on its employees and on its residents. It does something that we, I'm sure, appreciate that no elected official wants to have happen: it casts a pall of uncertainty right when you're looking forward to a budget for the coming year. That kind of uncertainty already has had its effect. Wall Street, for example, understands that the District budget is not final until it somehow is passed out of the Congress. The District pays a premium—it pays a price—for that because there are two bodies, not one, that get a say over its local budget.

No city should ever have to wonder whether it will be shut down. Shutdowns really don't occur at the local level because residents won't let it occur. They are close enough to the people so that that is not a threat you could much get away with at the local level. Here we are some levels above that, and most Members and most Americans don't know that there is local legislation that is put in that peril as I speak.

The District has about 630,000 residents. It's growing well. People are moving into the city, not out. There

are cranes all over town; and much of this comes out of the excellent management of the city, out of the way the city has conducted its economic affairs, out of the fact that it has an independent chief financial officer, who cannot be fired because he disagrees with the council or with the Mayor and, therefore, has to tell the truth. It's all worked together to make the District the kind of jurisdiction that the Congress, at least, should have no concerns about and, I believe, has no concerns about.

The price the District would pay is hard for me to make clear to Members because it would have to occur before they felt it. We have come close to feeling it; and almost 20 years ago, we did, in fact, feel it. There are some parts of your services to the people that continue, but huge parts cannot because the Congress has not passed the budget, not because the Congress objects to the budget and not because any Member of this House desires that outcome.

This House does not mean to hold the District budget as hostage. If it did, there would have been something the District could do to get out of the hostage fight. So what makes this so frustrating is that there is nothing we can give, nothing we can do to extricate ourselves from a fight that is wholly inside baseball within this Chamber and the Chamber across the way. To be sure, I have contacted my Senate allies; but, frankly, this has to be done here. We've got to get agreement on both sides of the aisle to the simple proposition that those of us who believe in the great and important freedoms of the Framers would least want to be held responsible for closing down a local jurisdiction, one with which we have no beef.

This country was established on a pedestal of federalism. One thing we understand is the difference between a local jurisdiction and its rights and responsibilities and ourselves. If anything, there are Members of this Chamber who would want some of what the Federal government does no longer done by the Federal Government at all but, in fact, to be the work of local jurisdictions. Many in this Chamber not only support but, indeed, believe that local jurisdictions do a better job at governing than does any institution at the Federal level. I can, therefore, find no set of principles here from any Member of Congress that would be in play when the decision is made on my amendment to the continuing resolution or on the bill that I will introduce as a fallback in case it does not occur.

As we go home, perhaps earlier than expected, to ponder what to do with keeping the Federal Government open, I ask that Members bear in mind that they would be closing not only Federal agencies but the District of Columbia Government. In the name of the people of the District of Columbia, I ask you, wherever we stand on the Federal Government, to allow the District of Columbia to move forward, to govern

itself, and to take care of its day-to-day business.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 281

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 281.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

THE INVESTIGATIONS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There are a couple of issues that are certainly worth elaborating on today. One is codified in The Wall Street Journal article from September 11, yesterday, and 7:35 p.m. is when it's timed out. It's regarding IRS Supervisor Lois Lerner. The article is entitled "Lois Lerner's Own Words."

The article reads:

Congress' investigation into the IRS targeting of conservatives has been continuing out of the Syria headlines, and it's turning up news. Emails unearthed by the House Ways and Means Committee between former director of Exempt Organizations Lois Lerner and her staff raise doubts about IRS claims that the targeting wasn't politically motivated and that low-level employees in Cincinnati masterminded the operation.

In a February 2011 email, Ms. Lerner advised her staff, including then Exempt Organizations technical manager Michael Seto and then Rulings and Agreements director Holly Paz, that a Tea Party matter is "very dangerous" and is something "counsel and Lerner adviser Judy Kindell need to be in on." Ms. Lerner adds, "Cincy should probably NOT have these cases."

That's a different tune than the IRS sang in May when former IRS Commissioner Steven Miller said the Agency's overzealous enforcement was the work of two "rogue" employees in Cincinnati. When the story broke, Ms. Lerner suggested that her office had been unaware of the pattern of targeting until she read about it in the newspaper. "So it was pretty much we started seeing information in the press that raised questions for us, and we went back and took a look," she said in May.

Mr. Speaker, so no one misunderstands, it is a crime to give false information to Congress.

The article goes on:

Earlier this summer, IRS lawyer Carter Hull, who oversaw the review of many Tea Party cases and questionnaires, testified that his oversight began in April 2010. Tea Party cases under review are "being supervised by Chip Hull at each step," Ms. Paz wrote to Ms. Lerner in a February 2011 email. "He reviews info from TPs—or Tea Partys—correspondence to TPs, et cetera. No decisions are going out of Cincy until we go all the way through the process with the (c)(3) and (c)(4) cases here."

The emails also put the targeting in the context of the media and congressional drumbeat over the impact of conservative campaign spending on the 2012 elections. On July 10, 2012, then Lerner adviser Sharon Light emailed Ms. Lerner a National Public Radio story on how outside money was making it hard for Democrats to hold their Senate majority.

It certainly appears that the IRS was weaponized for the political purpose of one party, which would, of course, be one of the worst nightmares for the Founders of this country. Of course, George Washington didn't even want us to have political parties—he warned of the danger there—and here we are, all this time later, with a group of Democratic operatives who are doing things with the IRS that Richard Nixon could have only dreamed of doing.

This article from *The Wall Street Journal* goes on:

The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee had complained to the Federal Election Commission that conservative groups like Crossroads GPS and Americans for Prosperity should be treated as political committees rather than 501(c)(4)s, which are tax-exempt social welfare groups that do not have to disclose their donors. "Perhaps the FEC will save the day," Ms. Lerner wrote back later that morning.

□ 1315

Having been a district judge presiding over criminal cases, that is what you would call, Mr. Speaker, a statement against interests by Ms. Lerner in a prior communication that directly contradicts what she said the motivation was. I think there are criminal implications here that need to be followed up.

In any event, the article goes on:

That response suggests Ms. Lerner's political leanings, and it also raises questions about Ms. Lerner's intentions in a separate email exchange she had when an FEC investigator inquired about the status of the conservative group, the American Future Fund. The FEC and IRS don't have the authority to share that information under section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code. But the bigger question is: Why did they want to? After the FEC inquiry, the American Future Fund also got a questionnaire from the IRS.

Again, that's from *The Wall Street Journal* dated last night.

When one party in power in the executive branch can weaponize its Federal agencies against its political opponents, unless it is stopped, this little experiment in democracy will come to an end. It will bring about the very things that the Founders had hoped would not happen but were realistic enough to talk about them at some length about when and if we might move to one person being able to grasp control of the Federal Government.

Of course, one of the things they used to try to keep that from happening was to give Congress the power of the purse, to give Congress oversight over the executive and judicial branches. When we've had Congress try to do oversight, whether it's over Fast and Furious, Benghazi, the IRS scandal, we've met with nothing but blinded opacity—not transparency—from

this administration. They have obfuscated constantly, done everything they can to prevent Congress from getting the truth about what they have called even phony scandals.

If they're so phony, why don't you get the transparency out here, Mr. Speaker? Let's get people out here with the truth and then we can see fully whether or not they're phony scandals. The more this drip, drip, drip of information comes out, the more it becomes clear as to why this administration has been hiding evidence and attempting to keep Congress from discovering things.

I have personally been pushing for many months now to have a special prosecutor investigate the Internal Revenue Service situation with regard to targeting for political purposes. The reason is that there are statutes that pertain to the IRS that could make some of this conduct potential crimes for which people could go to prison.

I am so proud that I became a friend of Chuck Colson before he passed. I think he is one of the great Christian luminaries of the 20th and 21st centuries. His becoming a Christian all came about after his arrogance and his willful disobedience of the law during the Nixon administration brought him to prison. He had possession of information from the FBI about someone. As I recall, that got him about 1½ years in prison. Yet, we have seen during the close of the Clinton years as President, one man having, at the White House, about 1,000 FBI files. If he had been held to the same standard as Chuck Colson, he would never have gotten out of prison, but nobody went to prison.

We've seen, as time has gone on and abuses within the executive branch have not been dealt with properly, the abuses have continued and gotten worse. From reports I hear from conservative groups, whether Tea Party, pro-Israel, pro-marriage, as it's been known throughout the history of mankind as being between a man and a woman, groups that just wanted the Constitution followed are all coming under attack—not all of the groups have, but most of the groups that have have been these type of groups—from the IRS.

Then I hear from others who are being hit by inquiries from the FEC, not about Democratic matters, but about contributions to the Republican candidates and party. Then we hear that the EPA and other Federal agencies are going after conservatives.

It is unbelievable how powerful this government has gotten and how dramatically it can affect the outcome of an election. We must make sure that these kinds of abuses stop. We have the power of the purse to stop it, and we should. If the administration is not going to be forthcoming with information about the IRS, then it may be necessary to defund part of the executive branch until such time as they become truthful.

The Department of Justice still has not been forthcoming on information

that in our Judicial Committee we've been trying to get. We still haven't gotten answers to all of the matters that ended up resulting in the Attorney General of the United States being held in contempt for failing and refusing to answer.

It would seem that in the Fast and Furious scandal, where this administration saw to it that 2,000 or so guns made their way into the hands of drug cartels in Mexico, resulting in the loss of hundreds of lives in Mexico and at least one or more here in the United States, that someone should be held to account. When no one is held to account, when there is no accountability, the abuses get worse. That's what we're hearing.

You would have thought once the IRS scandal had been exposed that people would be more cautious about going after conservative groups for political purposes. Since no one has been held accountable yet, no budgets cut, the arrogance and the political maneuvering within Federal agencies seems to be growing much worse.

I'm hoping that my friends on the other side of the aisle will understand that the pendulum swings back and forth. I cannot imagine a single of my Democratic friends across the aisle being nearly as composed as we've been on the Republican side of the aisle about the abuses if the shoe were on the other foot and those abuses were over Democratic groups that were trying to elect the next Democratic President. If they were, I should be helping the Democrats and I would help the Democrats, because there's no place for an administration that weaponizes for political purposes the agencies under its control. We've gone for over 200 years fighting and doing what we could to avoid that happening, yet here it's happening.

It is a Federal agency that I want to go to next that's been involved in carrying out the will of this administration.

Here's an article from yesterday from Breitbart, written by John Sexton. He says:

It has been nearly a year since the attack which killed four Americans in Benghazi. During that time, various minute-by-minute accounts of the attack have been published. In addition, the administration's decisions to refuse additional security requests and to revise its talking points after the attack have been examined in detail.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on, I would like to grab a couple of posters.

I would have felt good in life having Ty Woods and Glen Doherty covering my back, just as they were trying to do for the survivors for our American Government workers at our consulate in our annex in Benghazi.

These are the four people we've lost: Chris Stevens, Sean Smith, and our two former Navy seals, Ty Woods and Glen Doherty. They deserve the truth to come out.

This article continues:

But Benghazi may have been a case where most observers have missed the forest for the

trees. This is not an attempt to add new information so much as it is to collate the information that already exists from the most reputable journalistic sources.

To begin with, Benghazi was a CIA operation involving weapons, one which had no cover beyond a small mission that provided a diplomatic fig leaf for the effort. Officially, the CIA was there to track and collect dangerous weapons left over from the war that ousted Qadhafi. But the evidence suggests that the CIA was also either tacitly or actively involved in a multinational effort to ship those weapons to Syrian rebels. Our covert effort in Benghazi, Libya, was connected to our escalating involvement in Syria.

The general outlines of this CIA effort have been reported. One fact which has not been highlighted is that the U.N. arms embargo of Libya, which the United States helped pass in 2011, makes shipping weapons in or out of the country a violation of international law. Indeed, the way the U.N. resolution is written, even knowingly allowing such shipments to take place may be a violation of the agreement.

I want to add parenthetically here that some of our concerns with having a world court and international tribunals that have jurisdiction over American citizens is that they may have laws that they decide to enforce that are against or outside what our United States Constitution allows. I would submit that American individuals, whether they're CIA agents or military, should be accountable to the United States and under the United States Constitution and not some world court. And it should be worth noting that as this administration pushed U.N. resolutions—I'm not sure what the statute of limitations is, but if individuals within this administration then violated the international law that they pushed to create, then they probably need to be careful when they're traveling in years after they leave the White House or the administration efforts because, who knows, you might get an indictment somewhere in one of these international tribunals that you violated the U.N. law you passed. You got guns into or out of Libya, you violated the law.

People in this country need to understand that participating in the making of laws and that participating in the violation of laws have consequences.

This article continues:

In 2012, the Obama administration publicly claimed it was working on diplomatic and humanitarian responses to the situation in Syria. But behind the scenes, the United States was aware that a network of arms shipments was being created to support the rebels. This network involved shipping weapons from Qatar and, later, Libya to Turkey where they could be taken across the border and distributed to militia in Syria.

In June of 2012, The New York Times reported that a contingent of CIA agents were "operating secretly" in Turkey to help vet which groups would receive these weapons. But later reporting by the Times would indicate the CIA was doing more than vetting.

□ 1330

The article goes on down and mentions that The Wall Street Journal reported at the time, this was back in June, that:

The Central Intelligence Agency has begun moving weapons to Jordan from a network of secret warehouses and plans to start arming small groups of vetted Syrian rebels within a month, expanding U.S. support of moderate forces battling President Bashar al-Assad, according to diplomats and U.S. officials briefed on the plans. To sum up, the CIA encouraged the creation of a multinational arms pipeline, helped shop for weapons to fill it, vetted the groups who would receive those weapons in Syria and, since June of 2013, contributed U.S. weapons to the mix. With that backdrop in place, we can now return our attention to Libya.

During the U.S. involvement in overthrowing Libyan dictator Muammar Qadhafi during 2011, the Obama administration became aware that shipments of weapons were making their way to Qadhafi's troops, allowing them to resupply themselves and pose a greater threat to civilians.

I might add parenthetically that with Qadhafi, that Qadhafi was an ally of this administration and this country at the time, that this administration chose to destroy and help remove.

The article says:

So in February the U.S. and other allied nations including the U.K. and France pushed for a package of international sanctions which became U.N. Security Council Resolution 1970. Resolution 1970 condemned the bombing of civilians, imposed travel restrictions on Qadhafi and his inner circle, froze assets and, importantly, banned any transfer of arms to or from Libya. In addition, Resolution 1970 requires member states, upon discovery of such arms, to destroy them.

A second resolution, number 1973, was passed a month later in March 2011. It created a no-fly zone and reaffirmed that member states were expected to help enforce the embargo by inspecting any sea or air vessels believed to be shipping weapons to or from Libya. If discovered, such weapons were to be destroyed. But despite Resolution 1970, The New York Times reported in April 2011 that shipments of arms were reaching Libyan rebels from Qatar. Another in-depth story published in December 2012 describes how the U.S. winked at these shipments despite concerns that some weapons were falling into the hands of extremists.

Parenthetically, I might insert, duh. The article goes on:

In fact, the nature of our military strategy in Libya made partnering with Qatar necessary. The Obama administration wanted to avoid getting immersed in a ground war, which officials feared could lead the United States into another quagmire in the Middle East. As a result, the White House largely relied on Qatar and the United Arab Emirates, two small Persian Gulf states and frequent allies of the United States. After discussions among members of the National Security Council, the Obama administration backed the arms shipments from both countries, according to two former administration officials briefed on the talks. "The UAE was asking for clearance to send U.S. weapons," said one former official. "We told them it's okay to ship other weapons."

But the American support for the arms shipments from Qatar and the Emirates could not be completely hidden. NATO air and sea forces around Libya had to be alerted not to interdict the cargo planes and freighters transporting the arms into Libya from Qatar and the Emirates, American officials said.

Again, that would be a direct violation of the U.N. resolution that we helped pushed into international law.

The article says:

This pattern of winking at violation of the U.N. arms embargo of Libya was repeated after Qadhafi's ouster. With the war in Libya at an end and the one in Syria ramping up, the direction of the arms pipeline simply reversed itself. Whereas weapons had been coming into Libya from Qatar, they now headed out of Libya back to Qatar and from there on to either Mali or Syria by way of Turkey. A June 21, 2013 New York Times story points out that local militias were organizing these shipments—including flights this year from Tripoli and Benghazi. But these shipments out of Libya are said to have been taking place for a year, beginning several months before the 9/11 attack in Benghazi—

that killed these four American patriots.

To sum up, the U.S. approved and cleared a path for a pipeline of weapons into Libya during the revolution in 2011. That pipeline would eventually reverse course to provide the same spare weapons to rebel in Syria. Both efforts seem to violate the U.N. resolutions which the United States helped pass in early 2011. But late in 2011 the United States realized its revolution on the cheap in Libya had a worrisome downside. Thousands of dangerous anti-aircraft weapons were loose in Libya, attracting militants who might wish to use them to commit terrorist acts against civilian air traffic. Something had to be done.

So the article goes on to talk about how we sent people into Libya to try to reclaim the weapons that we had helped provide, including surface-to-air missiles. The article says:

A month later, just three days after the 9/11 attack in Benghazi, the Times of London reported that a Libyan ship carrying 400 tons of weapons, including SAM-7 surface-to-air anti-aircraft missiles, docked in Turkey. This was the largest known shipment of weapons to Syria at the time. The ship's captain, Omar Mousaeeb, was from Benghazi.

The article goes on to make light of the allegation that this is a phony scandal. If it's so phony, why is there so much in the way of effort to keep Congress from knowing what really happened? Reports have been that we have CIA agents with direct knowledge of what happened during the death of our four patriots. They are being polygraphed every 30 days to keep them quiet, and demanding to know if anyone has leaked any information to Congress or the media because this administration is doing absolutely everything they can to keep us from getting to the truth of what happened there.

And I have been greatly encouraged this week, and in a trip to the Middle East, where, over the safety and the future of the United States, people in a bipartisan way were very concerned about our involvement in Syria, that we should not get involved in Syria, that it would be a huge mistake. Some say Members of Congress should never travel outside their district or Washington, D.C., but what I have seen, and especially from a trip to the Middle East last week, we're not getting the straight information from this administration. If we want to know what's

really going on, where we are appropriating money, where we are making policy through our control of the purse strings—or lack of control—we've got to go to those areas and talk to the leaders involved. It's amazing what you find out. When leaders of allied countries tell us we don't understand you, what you are doing. Do you not know you went to war in Afghanistan for the Muslim Brotherhood—against the Muslim Brotherhood? There you were fighting the Taliban, and then you go to Libya, and—well, first to Egypt. We have helped the Muslim Brotherhood in the wrong places, and it needs to stop in Syria as well.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for September 11 and 12.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 130. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the Powell Recreation District in the State of Wyoming.

S. 157. An act to provide for certain improvements to the Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An act to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

S. 304. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Mississippi 2 parcels of surplus land within the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes.

S. 459. An act to modify the boundary of the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 16, 2013, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2831. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grapes Grown in Designated Area of Southeastern California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0005; FV13-925-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2832. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmit-

ting the Department's final rule — Increase in Fees for Voluntary Federal Dairy Grading and Inspection Services [Doc. No.: AMS-DA-10-0002] (RIN: 0581-AD25) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2833. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kiwifruit Grown in California and Imported Kiwifruit; Relaxation of Minimum Grade Requirement [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0032; FV13-920-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2834. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0076; FV13-932-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2835. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mango Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Nominations of Foreign Producers and Election of Officers [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0041] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2836. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Revising Reporting Requirements and New Information Collection [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0052; FV12-905-2 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2837. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2013-2014 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0064; FV13-985-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2838. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Modification of the General Cull and Handling Regulation for Area No. 2 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0001; FV13-948-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2839. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — User Fees for 2013 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [AMS-CN-12-0074] (RIN: 0581-AD30) received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2840. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Long Island in the State of New York; Changing Reporting Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-12-0002; FV12-929-1 FR] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2841. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cotton Board Rules and Regulations: Adjusting Supplemental Assessment on Imports (2013 Amendment) [Doc.: AMS-CN-12-0065] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2842. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Office of Justice Programs annual report for Fiscal Year 2012, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on Judiciary.

2843. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Health, United States, 2012 report"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2844. A letter from the Assistant Legal Advisor for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2845. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the National Emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2846. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2847. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting pursuant to Title II, Section 203, of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act (No FEAR Act), the Department's annual report for FY 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2848. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting the 2012 management report of the Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2849. A letter from the Inspector General, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting notification that the Commission recently began the audit of financial statements for the fiscal year 2013; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2850. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's final inventory list for 2011; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2851. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2852. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Endangered Species Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Sphaeralcea gieriichii* (Gierisch Mallow) [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2013-0018] (RIN: 1018-AZ46) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2853. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Diamond Darter [Docket No.: FWS-R5-ES-2012-

0045] (RIN: 1018-AY12) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2854. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Non-essential Experimental Population of *Topeka Shiner* (*Notropis topeka*) in Northern Missouri [Docket No.: FWS-R3-ES-2012-0087] (RIN: 1018-AY45) received August 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2855. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program for the period October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010 as required by section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2856. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *KM Enterprises, Inc., v. Global Traffic Technologies, Inc. and Global Traffic Technologies, LLC*, No. 12-3406, (Aug 2, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2857. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, *Milija Zivkovic v. Eric Holder, Jr.*, No. 12-2143, (July 31, 2013); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2858. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States for the March 2013 session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2859. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Deadline to Submit Opinion and Advisory Letter Applications for Defined Benefit Mass Submitter Plans is Extended to January 31, 2014 [Announcement 2013-37] received August 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2860. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's 2012 report entitled, "Department of Energy Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mr. STOCKMAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 3084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for the production of renewable chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 3085. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3349 West 111th Street in Chicago, Illinois, as

the "Captain Herbert Johnson Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3086. A bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3087. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the receipt of bonuses by Department of Veterans Affairs employees who violate Federal civil laws or regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 3088. A bill to concentrate Federal resources aimed at the prosecution of drug offenses on those offenses that are major; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3089. A bill to amend section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to pharmacy compounding; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. BARBER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. TONKO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 3090. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize Federal assistance to State adult protective services programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUNYAN, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. McCaul, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 3091. A bill to promote the development of meaningful treatments for patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 3092. A bill to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 3093. A bill to exclude individuals who receive health insurance coverage pursuant

to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement from tax credits and reductions in cost-sharing under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3094. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RADEL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.R. 3095. A bill to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rule-making proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 3096. A bill to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WATT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3097. A bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LATTI, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 3099. A bill to provide for the development of a fishery management plan for the Gulf of Mexico red snapper, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3100. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to make local funds of the District of Columbia available for use by the District during any portion of a fiscal year in which no Federal law appropriating local funds for the fiscal year is in effect, at the rates of operation provided under the local budget act for the fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the credit for employers establishing workplace child care

facilities, to increase the child care credit to encourage greater use of quality child care services, to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities, and to increase the exclusion for employer-provided dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. PERRY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MESSER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. STUTZMAN):

H.J. Res. 62. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal excise tax on heavy-duty trucks should not be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution urging all parties to the conflict in Syria to work through the United Nations and with the international community to hold the Assad regime accountable and resolve the crisis in Syria through a negotiated political settlement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. Res. 342. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2013 as "National Sepsis and Septic Shock Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RADEL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ROSS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. POSY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H. Res. 343. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable E. Clay Shaw, Jr., formerly a Representative of the State of Florida; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H. Res. 344. A resolution directing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to direct, for the purpose of interpreting Office of Personnel Management (OPM) guidance with respect to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, that the definition of "congressional staff" employed by an "official office" shall include all committee staff, all joint committee staff, and all staff employed by leadership offices of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 345. A resolution recognizing the importance of nonprofit organizations and expressing support for designation of May 16, 2014, as "National Nonprofit Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. RIBBLE):

H. Res. 346. A resolution recognizing the 110th anniversary of the founding of the Harley-Davidson Motor Company, which has been a significant part of the social, economic, and cultural heritage of the United States and many other nations and a leading force for product and manufacturing innovation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 3085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to establish Post Offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress as stated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 3088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power *** To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9

The Congress shall have Power *** To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court.

Article III, Section 1

The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.

Article III, Section 2

In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be a Party, the Supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. In all other Cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

Article IV, Section 1

Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general Laws prescribe the Manner in which such Acts, Records, and Proceedings shall be proved, and the Effect thereof.

Article I, Section 9, Clause 2

The Privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power *** To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia:

H.R. 3089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3090.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—to provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 3091.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 2, Clause 3

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 3092.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3093.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which states, "the Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa

H.R. 3094.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3095.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 3096.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The "necessary and proper" clause of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 3097.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 3098.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 3099.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3100.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3101.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 62.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law;"

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 25: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 200: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 207: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 274: Mr. MAFFEI and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 362: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 363: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 471: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 495: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 498: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 533: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 543: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 638: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 681: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 685: Ms. SCHWARTZ.

H.R. 689: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 713: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 724: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 792: Mr. HALL and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 797: Mr. PAULSEN and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 809: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 833: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 855: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. ENYART, Mr. FARR, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 911: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 920: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. DeFAZIO, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 942: Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1020: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1078: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1091: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 1180: Ms. DeGETTE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1201: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1248: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1250: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 1303: Mr. TIPTON and Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.

H.R. 1309: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1310: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1318: Mr. HONDA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1339: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1431: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1462: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1466: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1485: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1523: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1666: Mr. FARR, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1717: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1775: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1779: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 1795: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1812: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1830: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1838: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1869: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1905: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1908: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1926: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1962: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1998: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2011: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2085: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 2134: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2199: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2203: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2226: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2247: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTA, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2300: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. TIPTON.

H. R. 2318: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2328: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 2330: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 2480: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2482: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2502: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2561: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2590: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2643: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2682: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2686: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 2692: Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2715: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2720: Mr. KIND and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2725: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2745: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 2772: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2773: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2797: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2807: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 2809: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HARPER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2835: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2878: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2901: Mr. CULBERSON and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2917: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2939: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2955: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2989: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 2998: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3023: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 3037: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 3043: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3055: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 3067: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 3076: Mr. FLORES and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.J. Res. 47: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. MICA.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mrs. ROBY.

H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 30: Mr. ENYART.

H. Res. 231: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. NOLAN.

H. Res. 319: Mr. HORSFORD.

H. Res. 341: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Res. 281: Ms. GABBARD.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Member added his name to the following discharge petition:

Petition 4 by Mr. STOCKMAN on House Resolution 306: Dana Rohrabacher.